


NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06728229 7



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

LIVES OF EMINENT

AND

ILLUSTRIOUS ENGLISHMEN.

LIVES OF EMINENT
AND
ILLUSTRIOUS ENGLISHMEN,

FROM
ALFRED THE GREAT TO THE LATEST TIMES,

On an Original Plan.

EDITED BY
GEORGE GODFREY CUNNINGHAM.

ILLUSTRATED BY A SERIES OF FINELY EXECUTED PORTRAITS, SELECTED FROM THE
MOST AUTHENTIC SOURCES, AND ENGRAVED BY EMINENT ARTISTS.

VOLUME II.

GLASGOW:
A. FULLARTON & CO., 110, BRUNSWICK STREET,
AND 6, ROXBURGH PLACE, EDINBURGH.

MDCCCXXXVII.

RELIGIOUS
LIBRARY
NEW-YORK

GLASGOW:
FILLANTON & CO, PRINTERS, VILLAGE FLD.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

FOURTH PERIOD.

	Page
HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION, . . .	1

I.—POLITICAL SERIES.

114. Henry VII., . . .	10
115. Edward Plantagenet, . . .	17
116. Edmund Dudley, . . .	18
117. Henry VIII., . . .	20
118. Cardinal Wolsey, . . .	31
119. Anne Boleyn, . . .	39
120. Sir Thomas Moore, . . .	44
121. Cromwell, Earl of Essex, . . .	51
122. Stafford, Duke of Buckingham, . . .	55
123. Seymour, Duke of Somerset, . . .	56
124. Thomas, Lord Seymour, . . .	59
125. Edward VI., . . .	62
126. Dudley, D. of Northumberland, . . .	63
127. Lady Jane Grey, . . .	64
128. Mary I., . . .	68
129. Sir Thomas Wyatt, the younger, . . .	71
130. Russell, Earl of Bedford, . . .	72
131. Sir Thomas Pope, . . .	74
132. Cardinal Pole, . . .	75
133. Elizabeth, . . .	78
134. Sir Thomas Chaloner, . . .	90
135. Lady Catherine Grey, . . .	91
136. Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, . . .	93
137. Sir Ralph Sadler, . . .	94
138. Sir Nicholas Bacon, . . .	95
139. Sir Thomas Gresham, . . .	97
140. Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, . . .	100
141. Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, . . .	102
142. Dudley, Earl of Leicester, . . .	105
143. Sir Humphrey Gilbert, . . .	109
144. Sir Francis Walsingham, . . .	112
145. Sir Christopher Hatton, . . .	115
146. Sir John Perrot, . . .	117
147. Sir John Hawkins, . . .	118
148. Sir Francis Drake, . . .	120
149. Cecil, Lord Burleigh, . . .	123

	Page
150. Devereux, Earl of Essex, . . .	128
151. Clifford, Earl of Cumberland, . . .	137
152. Vere, Earl of Oxford, . . .	140
153. Sir Edmund Anderson, . . .	141
154. Blount, Earl of Devonshire, . . .	141
155. Sir Francis De Vere, . . .	143

II.—ECCLESIASTICAL SERIES.

156. Cardinal Bourchier, . . .	148
157. Archbishop Morton, . . .	149
158. Bishop Alcock, . . .	150
159. Fox, Bishop of Durham, . . .	151
160. Archbishop Warham, . . .	153
161. John Frith, . . .	154
162. Elizabeth Barton, . . .	156
163. Bishop Fisher, . . .	158
164. William Tyndale, . . .	159
165. John Bradford, . . .	163
166. Hugh Latimer, . . .	164
167. Bishop Ridley, . . .	167
168. Bishop Hooper, . . .	168
169. Archbishop Cranmer, . . .	172
170. Bishop Gardiner, . . .	178
171. Bishop Tunstall, . . .	180
172. John Bale, . . .	182
173. Miles Coverdale, . . .	185
174. Bishop Ponner, . . .	189
175. Bishop Jewel, . . .	190
176. Archbishop Parker, . . .	193
177. Richard Cox, . . .	196
178. Bernard Gilpin, . . .	197
179. Archbishop Grindal, . . .	199
180. John Fox, . . .	201
181. Cardinal Allen, . . .	204
182. Bishop Aylmer, . . .	207
183. Archbishop Whitgift, . . .	209
184. Richard Hooker, . . .	215
185. Dean Nowell, . . .	219
186. Thomas Cartwright, . . .	221

	Page		Page
III.—LITERARY SERIES.			
187. William Grocyn, . . .	226	217. Sir Thomas Overbury, . .	351
188. John Colet, . . .	227	218. Egerton, Lord Ellesmere, .	353
189. William Lily, . . .	229	219. Sir Ralph Winwood, . . .	355
190. Thomas Linacre, . . .	229	220. Sir Walter Raleigh, . . .	356
191. John Skelton, . . .	232	221. Brook, Lord Cobham, . . .	363
192. Bouchier, Lord Berners, .	233	222. Sir John Davies, . . .	365
193. Sir Thomas Wyatt, the Elder,	234	223. Foulk, Lord Brooke, . . .	366
194. Howard, Earl of Surrey, .	236	224. Villiers, Duke of Buckingham,	368
195. John Leland, . . .	241	225. Charles I., . . .	374
196. Sir John Cheke, . . .	242	226. Sir Dudley Carleton, . . .	383
197. Sebastian Cabot, . . .	244	227. Sir John Eliot, . . .	385
198. Thomas, Lord Vaux, . . .	247	228. Sir Edward Coke, . . .	387
199. John Heywood, . . .	248	229. William Noy, . . .	391
200. Roger Ascham, . . .	251	230. Sir Henry Wotton, . . .	393
201. Walter Haddon, . . .	255	231. Thomas, Earl of Strafford,	395
202. John Caius, . . .	256	232. Robert, Lord Willoughby,	402
203. Raphael Holmshed, . . .	258	233. John Hampden, . . .	402
204. Sir Philip Sidney, . . .	260	234. John Pym, . . .	410
205. Thomas Cavendish, . . .	265	235. Cary, Viscount Falkland, .	411
206. Christopher Marlowe, . .	267	236. Spencer, Earl of Sunderland,	417
207. Spenser, . . .	270	237. George, Lord Goring, . . .	418
208. Reginald Scott, . . .	277	238. Edward, Lord Herbert, . .	419
209. Thomas, Lord Sackville, .	278	239. James, Earl of Derby, . . .	421
210. John Dee, . . .	281	240. Henry Ireton, . . .	424
FIFTH PERIOD.			
HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION, . . .		287	
I.—POLITICAL SERIES.			
211. James I., . . .	330	246. Sir Henry Vane, the Younger,	450
212. Robert Catesby, . . .	339	247. Sir Richard Fanshawe, . .	455
213. Sir Everard Digby, . . .	341	248. Bertie, Earl of Lindsey, . .	456
214. Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, .	343	249. William Prynne . . .	457
215. Henry, Prince of Wales, . .	347	250. Thomas, Lord Fairfax, . . .	464
216. John, Lord Harrington, . .	350	251. Monk, Duke of Albemarle . .	468
		252. Montagu, Earl of Sandwich,	471



Sir Francis Drake.

O.B. 1596

Engraved by Freeman, from an Original Painting.

Published by Arch^d Fullarton & Co Glasgow







*Sir Francis Bacon
Viscount of Albans.*

Engraved by J. Freeman.



Oliver Cromwell

Engraved by J. Goussier from the original portrait





Sir Walter Raleigh.

Engraved by J. Goussier from the original painting.



Geoffrey Chaucer

Composed by the author

Printed by the author at the office of the printer

London: Printed by the author at the office of the printer



HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

TO FOURTH PERIOD,

EXTENDING

**FROM THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VII. TO THE ACCESSION
OF JAMES I.**

WITH

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES

OF

Eminent Englishmen

WHO FLOURISHED DURING THAT PERIOD.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

TO

FOURTH PERIOD.

Termination of the struggle betwixt the houses of York and Lancaster—Foreign relations of England—Commercial spirit of the times—State of the country—The Reformation—Its origin—Progress under Henry VIII—Under Edward VI—Religious struggles of Mary's reign—General view of Elizabeth's reign—Of English literature.

THE year 1485 is remarkable in the history of England, as that in which the war betwixt the rival houses of York and Lancaster was terminated by the battle of Bosworth, and the earl of Richmond was seated as Henry VII. on the English throne. His accession, founded on a very disputable claim, was followed by attempts against his government from among the opposite party in the state, but his power and influence survived. By his marriage with a princess of the rival family of York, his son and successor Henry VIII. could advance a stronger hereditary claim; and under the latter monarch, and his three children, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth—all of them, in course, his successors on the throne—there occurred in England some of the most remarkable transactions which its history records. So prominently, however, did almost all the reigning monarchs of this period act in the public matters that pertain to it, that these transactions are, to a great degree, involved in our sketches of the sovereigns themselves, and in this introductory sketch we shall only glance at certain prominent features in this memorable period of English history.

England was wont to stand in a side or central relation, as it were, to the contending interests and discordant politics of the great continental powers; and in the period under review we find its arms directed, now against France, and anon against Spain, that country's formidable enemy. War with France was declared early in the reign of Henry VII., and in 1522, hostilities against that country were renewed by his son and successor Henry VIII. which, at intervals, were continued afterwards. But the wars with Spain during this eventful period present a more imposing and memorable scene. It is not until the reign of Elizabeth, however, that they assume such peculiar interest, as of vast religious and national importance. In that reign, Philip II. and the English queen—separated

by character and religion—carried on a course of mutual hostility, in the progress of which, English influence was established in the revolted provinces of the Low countries, and English glory was swelled by the defeat of the boasted ‘Invincible Armada.’ These circumstances may serve to explain the extent to which military and naval distinctions adorn the names of English nobles and English commoners in this period of British history. It may be added, that Scotland and Ireland were also the scenes of English warfare in the course of these busy times. In Elizabeth’s reign, in particular, the wish to gratify a queen who set her heart on the success of naval and military enterprise,—the sense of actual danger to the independence and religion of the country, from the bigotry and energy of Spain,—the hopes inspired by prosperous efforts,—and the honour of engaging in the bold and enterprising adventures of the time, are motives which may all have tended to render the court of Elizabeth so chivalrous a scene, and her reign so remarkable a period in the naval and military annals of the land.

But even in the 15th century, the foreign enterprise of England, corresponding to the parallel cases of Spain and Portugal, assumes the aspect rather of geographical discovery or commercial enterprise than of political hostility. The laws respecting trade, indeed, which were passed during this period, partook of that restrictive character to which, in later times, political economists have furnished formidable objections; but the commercial spirit was abroad, and to this period belong some memorable facts in the history of our mercantile and maritime affairs. It was in 1487, that the cape of Good Hope was discovered by Bartholomew Diaz, and in 1492, that America was first explored by Christopher Columbus. Following in the train of these great events was a voyage of discovery which the English navigator Sebastian Cabot, undertook in 1495, by letters patent from Henry VII. who, by the erection of the celebrated ship, the *Great Harry*, may be said, according to Mr Hume, to have begun the English navy. This is not the place for a minute detail of the discoveries of Cabot, or the voyages of Drake, or other remarkable incidents in the naval or commercial history of England: but as symptomatic of the times, and as presenting important points in that history, it may here be noticed, that in the brilliant reign of Queen Elizabeth—the last in the period under review—we find established a trade with Muscovy and Turkey,—the Royal Exchange was built,—interest was legalized,—a charter was granted to the East India company,—and, in the year 1582, there were upwards of 12,000 English ships, of which, however, only 217 were of more than 80 tons burden.

The well known energy of the Tudor princes, acting on the acknowledged powers and prerogatives of the English sovereign, renders the period of their successive reigns a scene of monarchical authority and parliamentary submission somewhat revolting perhaps to the modern freeman. But in the parliaments—at least of the two female sovereigns of the line—there are discerned the risings of the sentiments and energy which produced such mighty changes in succeeding reigns. This period, however, has been remarked for the comparative order and quiet established in the country. “In the disorderly state of England under the Plantagenets, who governed it from about the middle of the

12th till towards the end of the 15th century," says Dr Adam Smith,¹ "one district might be in plenty, while another, at no great distance, by having its crop destroyed, either by some accident of the seasons, or by the incursion of some neighbouring baron, might be suffering all the horrors of a famine; and yet if the lands of some hostile lord were interposed between them, the one might not be able to give the least assistance to the other. Under the vigorous administration of the Tudors, who governed England during the latter part of the 15th, and through the whole of the 16th century, no baron was powerful enough to disturb the public security."

But among the various changes in the condition of England belonging to this period, assuredly none is more memorable than the reformation of the church. It has been often observed, that the Reformation was not in England the result of wise deliberations, or the natural fruit of popular improvement. In this remark there is truth on the surface, but error in the centre and the application. Few important revolutions have been brought about by the direct influence of reason. In the instances in which such attempts have been made, they have usually failed, or led to very inadequate results, the speculations of the wisest men being a far too uncertain substratum for the movements of the multitude. When closely looked at, moreover, the above observation will lose much of its force as an historical dogma. It will be recollected, that if Henry the Eighth was the prime mover of the Reformation in this country, and began his measures from motives rather personal than public, the same has been the case with reformers of much higher and purer characters, and that some of the grandest and most useful changes ever produced in the world have owed their beginning to circumstances as unlike the result as the clod is to the richly scented plant which it nourishes. The careful observer, however, can hardly fail to discover a much stronger connexion between the reformation of religion in England and the state of the community, than is sometimes supposed to have been the case. He will see that there had long been a tendency in the church itself to break the bonds in which the Roman pontiff desired to hold it; and he will perceive, moreover, that this tendency of the church to liberate itself was working with the slow motion of an hour-hand, while the opinion of the people was urging on to the same point with the celerity of a minute-hand. It was next to impossible, in fact, that a community should be incessantly bent on resisting the imposition of taxes, and saving their money by every feasible plan of economy, and not look with a suspicious eye on the enormous revenue of the clergy. Still more unlikely is it that they should have been advancing in intelligence,—have begun to form correct notions of law and right policy, and corrected many of their views on practical subjects, without discovering that they were burdened by the priesthood with practices which had no connexion with the pure religion of the gospel. These were the preventing causes of the Reformation in England, so far as mere human and temporary circumstances can be considered in that light; and to examine and watch their action, combined as they soon were with causes of a different and more spiritual nature, is an employ-

ment worthy of the highest order of intellects. From the reign of Henry the Eighth, men of every species of talent, and of every class of character, found themselves invested with new importance,—excited to action by new impulses both from within and without,—and called upon to perform duties which, if not themselves new, had a novel and wider range of influence. The great conflict of the reforming division of the clergy with those who yet supported the Roman doctrines and discipline, called into play every particle of knowledge and ability which either party possessed. Many displays, therefore, of extraordinary talent may be looked for in this period without disappointment. Scholarship not only rose in value among scholars, but became a commodity of intelligible, palpable worth with the multitude: it was recognised as the power by which the highest interests were to be settled, and those who possessed it were at once raised to the most conspicuous stations in the community. The love of gaiety, the courtly luxury and splendour, which at the same time distinguished the age, called forth many a sparkling wit, and nourished the infant arts into partial maturity. Nor was either war, or political business wanting for the employment of talents of another description; so that this era furnishes the biographer with a fruitful field of inquiry, and both in a literary, and purely historical sense, is deserving of the most careful study.

The reign of Edward the Sixth, was too short to realize the expectations which had been formed respecting the effect of his auspices on science, the reformed religion, and whatever pertained to the public prosperity. But brief as it was, it served to strengthen the operation of the good principles which had begun to work in the days of his father. The reformed doctrines, as they became better understood, were more clearly expounded and more zealously defended. The piety of the young king invited men of virtue and integrity to the court, and placed them in the highest offices of trust. His own attachment to learning, like that of his father, contributed greatly to its more general and ardent cultivation. In his boyhood even, he was accustomed to write to his sisters, the princesses Mary and Elizabeth, in Latin. He was, however, at all times ready to enter upon the discussion of questions, not only of the most difficult nature, but of such as only a prince, surrounded by the most honest instructors and councillors, would have ventured to approach. The account given of his conversation with the celebrated astronomer Cardan, has been rightly quoted as a proof of the exceeding ingenuity and acuteness of his mind. “He asked me,” says the philosopher, “what was the subject of my book *De Rerum varietate*, which I had dedicated to him.” “I said, in the first chapter I show the cause of comets, which has been so long sought for in vain.” “What is it?” “It is the concurrence of the light of the wandering stars.” But the king said, “as the stars move in such different motions, this concurrence must be dissipated or moved by their movement.” Cardan replied, “it moves after them, and with more celerity, as a rainbow from glass, or as the sun shines on a wall.” “How can that be?” rejoined the young king, “there is nothing like a wall in the sky to receive this light.” Cardan, it is added thought he answered this defeating remark by comparing his concurrence with the milky way, or the lucid middle space between many lighted candles. Convinced however of Edward’s ability, who was then

only in his fifteenth year, he warmly praises his accomplishments, and remarks that he “spoke Latin not less *polite et prompte* than himself.”² Under the patronage of such a prince, it is not surprising to find the universities becoming in the true sense of the expression, “seminaries of sound learning and religious education.” The nation, however, was still in a sufficiently agitated state with regard to religion, to call for the most energetic exertion on the part of the reformers, both priests and statesmen. Such was the irritation which prevailed among the teachers of the gospel at this time, that it was deemed necessary to interdict their exercise of private judgment as to what they should say in the performance of their public duties. This singular ordinance is said to have been framed, because that certain of the licensed preachers had “behaved themselves irreverently, and without good order in their preachings,” and that therefore, “all manner of persons, whosoever they be, are inhibited to preach in open audience in the pulpit or otherwise, by any sought colour or fraud, to the disobeying of this commandment, to the intent that the whole clergy in this mean space, might apply themselves to prayer to Almighty God, for the better achieving of the same most Godly intent and purpose, &c.”³ The means employed by the enemies of the reformation to overcome the obstacle thus placed in the way of their invectives, is in some degree characteristic of the times, and of the state both of literature and public feeling. In the emphatic language of the old historian, “the pulpit being shut and silent by proclamation, the stage was the more open and vocal for the same: the popish priests which, though unseen, stood behind the hanging, or lurked in the tying-house, removed their invectives from sermons to plays, and a more proper place indeed for the venting thereof.”⁴ No sooner was this licentiousness of the stage observed, than another ordinance was issued, prohibiting for a time dramatic performances. But neither this, nor the proclamation which silenced the pulpits remained long in force, and considering the acknowledged authority of such ordinances, and the excited state of the public mind, there is much greater reason to applaud the prudence and humanity of the government, than there would have been, had it allowed either the clergy or the players to foment treason, and then punished them for the crime. The principles of toleration, however, were as yet but very imperfectly understood, and some of the best men of the age fell, it is well known, into the wretched error of supposing that they had a right to rule over the consciences of men with a rod of iron. While men of piety allowed themselves to be thus deluded by their zeal, others of a different character, gladly seized upon the common motives to contention, to forward their own designs. Thus the reign of the pious and amiable Edward was disfigured by several events of the darkest hue, and which indicate through how many obstacles the light of truth and rational freedom had yet to penetrate before it reached the heart of the commonwealth.

The sanguinary struggles of Mary’s reign afford a melancholy proof of the fervour and intense devotion which pervaded the hearts of the Protestants. In tracing the history of their leaders,—of the men who exhorted them to persevere in their holy profession, and set them the

² Turner’s History of Reigns of Edward VI. &c. p. 159.

³ Fuller’s Church Hist. p. 389.

⁴ Idem. p. 390.

example by first suffering themselves,—the mind may acquire a species of wisdom which it will seek for in vain in the history of states and statesmen, of war and warriors. It was a period of excitement, such as has rarely been witnessed. Never was the right of conscience more fiercely battled for; never did zeal assume a more furious aspect. On the side of both the persecutors and the persecuted, religion was the one great object of thought,—the one motive of action,—the supreme, all-engrossing mistress of the mind and heart. Sad as is the spectacle which the results of this state of feeling produced in the reign of Mary, it would be an injustice not to acknowledge that there was a degree of grandeur in this devotion of a community to the highest subjects of human thought, and that, perverted as was the principle by the most terrible of errors, its concentration in the popular mind betokens how vast a stride had morally been made when the nation could thus resign itself to influences which derive so little of their force from mere worldly or material considerations. The Cranmers and the Gardiners, the Ridleys and the Bonners, were the representatives of multitudes inspired by the same holy, or the same fiery zeal; and could history look with a minuter eye on the transactions of the period, there is little doubt but that the instances of a very near approach to their character in the persons of undistinguished individuals would be found extraordinarily numerous.

But the struggle was not simply between Protestantism and Catholicism, or between those who desired to see the human mind emancipated from the worst slavery, and those who desired to rivet its fetters—but between those tendencies to general improvement which now characterised the nation, and the opposing forces which would have resettled it in ignorance. From the reservoirs of learning among the Lebanons of knowledge, refreshing rills, though at first small and minute, descend to the plain. The state of the community is always more or less influenced by the prevailing studies of its scholars; and when it is considered how greatly the Reformation, and the improvement of the people, which we have been contemplating, were owing to the annihilation of false systems of science and study, it will be well-understood how much danger was incurred at this period when Mary and her counsellors resolved on the restoration of scholasticism. Happily for the nation and mankind, the seeds of genuine knowledge had been too widely scattered to suffer such an attempt to succeed; but had this queen's reign been prolonged, it is impossible to say what would have been the injuries sustained by that active and inquisitive spirit, which was as yet of too short a growth to sustain, without harm, the continued pressure of ignorance. The scholastic method of studying theology was essential to the support of Catholicism. Its tortuous argumentations allowed the student quietly to part with truth on the way, and its syllogisms hedged them within a circle, round which they might run with the highest degree of speed, without ever advancing one step nearer the great sources of knowledge.

The accession of Elizabeth was an event to which we may still look back with a feeling of gladness. With it was connected the re-establishment of principles, of which we, as well as our forefathers, enjoy the beneficent effects. A revolution could not have produced a greater change than that which followed this event. The gloom which the

bigotry of Mary had spread over the nation—a gloom not less experienced by those who agreed with her in severity, than by those who were the objects of her persecution—immediately gave way to stirring, hopeful anticipations. The dangers which had threatened the constitution, or many of the principles which formed its firmest support, vanished at the appearance of a princess on the throne who had no dark or secret interests to promote. There was every reason to apprehend, from the machinations of Mary in aid of her favourite objects, that not only the public liberty, but the national independence; would fall a sacrifice to her counsels. Her attempts to change the order of succession,—to restore the pope to his supremacy in the English church,—and to win, if possible, the attentions of the haughty and sullen Philip, by conceding to him the authority which she had alone the right to assume,—these were all in manifest opposition to that spirit of freedom and intelligence which had now obtained a wide influence in the community. Both religiously and politically, therefore, the country had the strongest motives for hailing with satisfaction the accession of Elizabeth; and we may ascribe much of that fresh, spring-like gaiety and vigour which characterize the literature of this age, to the sudden and felicitous impulse which the general mind thus received. There was, however, a numerous set of obstacles in the way of those improvements in the state of the country, which were so devoutly to be desired. Though the direst of evils had been incurred by the people at large, from the anxiety and distrust consequent on persecution, there was a large multitude who would have gladly endured a continuance of those evils rather than see the protestants freed from danger. The situation, moreover, in which the nation was placed, in reference to foreign potentates, demanded the most cautious counsels; and while, on the one hand, a feeling of triumph inspired many, there were others who, equally joyful at the change, were sobered into the exercise of the most thoughtful prudence. An admirable class of men was thus brought into action by the necessities of the time, while the brightening prospects which it exhibited gave birth to the happiest spirit of poetry and the arts. Among Elizabeth's earliest counsellors were some of the wisest politicians whose names are to be found in English history. Sir Nicholas Bacon, Cecil, Walsingham, stand at the head of those public men to whom we are indebted for the introduction of that enlightened system of politics which set the Machiavellism of foreign courts at defiance. Had it not been for their calm and temperate advice, the sudden change which the protestants found in their condition might have been the cause of new offences—not the less dangerous because from another quarter—against justice and religion. The address with which Bacon, as lord-keeper, opened the parliament, is a valuable illustrative document, and serves as a key to the characters and opinions of many of the most conspicuous men of the day. It was his object, he said, to lay before them “the distracted state of the nation, both in matters of religion and the other miseries that the wars and late calamities had brought upon them.” “For religion,” he remarked, “the queen desired they would consider of it without heat or partial affection, or using any reproachful term of papist or heretic; and that they would avoid the extremes of idolatry and superstition on the one hand, and contempt and irreligion on the other; and that they would examine matters

without sophistical niceties, or too subtle speculations, and endeavour to settle things so as might bring the people to an uniformity and cordial agreement in them." In regard to the state of the nation, he declared, that the queen was very unwilling to lay any new impositions upon them, and that, notwithstanding her necessities, "she would desire no supply, but what they did freely and cheerfully offer."⁵ The advice which Cecil gave her majesty on the topics alluded to in this speech, was founded on a similar cautiousness of temper, and gives a striking picture of the real difficulties which environed the nation in its passage from the late period of darkness and trouble. "The bishop of Rome," said he, "will be incensed: he will excommunicate the queen, interdict the realm, give it a prey to all princes that will enter upon it, and stir them up to it by all manner of means. The French king will be encouraged more to the war. He will be in great hope of aid from hence, of those discontented with this alteration, looking for tumults and discords. Scotland will have the same causes of boldness. Ireland also will be very difficultly stayed in obedience, by reason of the clergy; that is so addicted to Rome."⁶ But notwithstanding the threatening aspect of the continent, and the fearful balancing of strength between the hottest partizans of the opposite systems, the kingdom found itself, in a short time, again advancing to prosperity. The difficulties with which the partizans of the Reformation were surrounded, served but to stimulate their leaders to more strenuous exertions: the dangers which threatened the nation from abroad were met by an increased and more lively patriotism; the parliament and the sovereign were closely united in furthering the same purposes; and the church, now aided by the talents and the experience of men who had learnt much in suffering, emerged from the cloud with which the sanguinary fumes of persecution had enveloped it.

The most general view of the commencement of Elizabeth's reign enables us to discover many prognostics of its subsequent splendour. A superintending and almighty Providence appears to have so ordered it, that the establishment of the reformed religion should be attended, in this country, with the most manifest signs of its utility. Thus the purifying of the church, as to its rites and ceremonies, was followed by a corresponding improvement in the intellectual condition of the people: the advancement of theological science, by the aid of sound learning, more practical than dogmatical, but sufficiently doctrinal to show its constant bearing on divine truth, seemed to prepare the way for the greatest reformation in every other species of study that had as yet been experienced. And this may fairly lead us to observe, that Elizabeth's reign was throughout distinguished by the cultivation of objects of utility; that it was the very opposite of those in which the appearance of prosperity resulted from the factitious display of unprofitable conquests; and that we have hence a very striking proof, how far preferable is the dominion of common sense, of sound practical intelligence, even for poetical literature, to the rule of gaiety and luxury, where the ordinary interests of mankind are forgotten. Elizabeth's reign was the golden age of English literature, because religion and the homely duties, both of public and of private life, were cultivated with

⁵ *Barnet's Hist. Reform*, vol. ii. p. 590. ⁶ *Turner*, note, p. 315.

assiduous care. The sovereign, in her sphere, was an example to each of her subjects in theirs. She was not averse to cheerful displays of wealth, but she was ever anxious to provide for its security. "She made some progress," it is said of her, "in paying those great debts which lay upon the crown; she regulated the coin, which had been much debased by her predecessors; she furnished her arsenals with great quantity of arms from Germany and other places; engaged her nobility and gentry to imitate her example in this particular; introduced into the kingdom the art of making gunpowder and brass cannon; fortified her frontiers on the side of Scotland; made frequent reviews of the militia; encouraged agriculture, by allowing a free exportation of corn; promoted trade and navigation, and so much increased the shipping of her kingdom, both by building vessels of force herself, and suggesting like undertakings to the merchants, that she was justly styled the restorer of naval glory, and the queen of the northern seas."⁷ The confidence which this conduct generated in her subjects was of the utmost importance to the country. It went far towards repressing the murmurs of even religious malecontents: the blessings of security, of plenty enjoyed in peace, are not unfelt even by the most bigoted, though they come from their opponents; and they operate like a strong but unsuspected sedative on the mind of many a popular polemic.

It ought not, however, to be forgotten, that there were many events in the reign of Elizabeth which tended to imbue the active spirit of the times with higher feelings than those resulting from the mere contemplation of utility. The defeat of the Spaniards, of their invincible armada, produced effects on the nation internally of much greater consequence than those, great as they were, which resulted to it politically. A chivalrous desire to meet the enemy filled the mind of almost every man in the kingdom. To the request which the ministers made to the city of London, that it would contribute five thousand men and fifteen ships, it sent in answer, ten thousand men and thirty ships. This sentiment, while it surmounted all others which the politics of the day called forth, did really exalt the national character, by making the people conscious of the power they possessed, and leading them to understand how entirely the preservation of their freedom depended on their bravery and sacrifices. Even the lowest of the soldiers partook of the enthusiasm; and Stowe says that he saw them marching towards Tilbury "with cheerful countenances, courageous words and gestures, and dancing and leaping, wheresoever they came; while in the camp their most felicity was the hope of fighting with the enemy, where oftentimes, divers reports ran of their foes' approach, and that present battle would be given them, then were they as joyful at such news as if lusty giants were to run a race."⁸ These feelings, in minds of a higher order, could not fail to re-awaken those ennobling principles which sometimes sparkled forth in the best days of chivalry, but had been generally stifled in their birth by the burdensome pomp of the institution. Now they had free play, and such men as Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Francis Drake, and others of the same class, the true ancestors of English nobility, were greatly indebted, for their virtues and accom-

⁷ Hume, vol. iv. c. 33. ⁸ Stowe, p. 744.

plishments, to the bright age of patriotism,—of mingled trial and prosperity,—of business and of sentiment, in which they had the fortunate lot to be born.

Acting in a very different way on the public mind, but not unbene-
ficially, was the mingled sentiment of indignation and horror with
which it beheld the conduct of France towards the unfortunate protes-
tants of that country. Sympathy for those who suffer in defending
principles for which we ourselves contend is of a quite different nature
to the ordinary emotion of compassion which goes by the same name.
Nor can a nation receive a more powerful impulse in its moral
advancement and capacities. Corruptions of truth are never so palpa-
ble to the unpractised eye as when conjoined with violations of justice
and humanity. They compel reason and passion to labour under the same
yoke; and, situated as England was at the time of the Bartholomew
massacre, there can be little doubt but that the feelings which it in-
spired contributed in a high degree to animate multitudes with a deeper
and more ardent gratitude for the light they enjoyed. Nor were the nu-
merous precautions which it was found necessary to take against the
attempts of the Catholic princes and their emissaries without their in-
fluence in another point of view. The tone of society was thereby pre-
vented from degenerating into tameness,—pleasure was enjoyed with a
richer zest,—a full and warm colouring of natural sentiment diffused it-
self over the common customs of life,—and the picturesqueness of the
age, delighting in masques and revelries, was easily made to furnish
types of true poetical force and beauty.

We might greatly extend our observations on the circumstances
which were combined in rendering the age of Elizabeth so glorious a
period of English history. It might be added, that the intercourse
which now took place with the most distant countries was in no slight
measure favourable to improvement, and that the writers of the day
had the advantage of that importation of Spanish literature and histori-
cal traditions which had occurred in the preceding reign. But the brief
view we have taken is sufficient to point out the main incentives to ex-
ertion which the great men of the age received from without; and,
while the names of Shakspeare, Spenser, and the rest who formed the
splendid galaxy of which they were the centre stars, afford us more than a
remembrance of that memorable era, may we look with pleasure, and not
without instruction, at even the probable causes which tended to the
developement of their genius.

I.—POLITICAL SERIES.

Henry VIII.

BORN A. D. 1457.—DIED A. D. 1509.

THIS prince was born in 1457. His father was Edmund, earl of
Richmond, son of Sir Owen Tudor, by Catherine of France. His

mother was Margaret, daughter of John, duke of Somerset, who was grandson, by a spurious branch, of John of Gaunt, the son of Edward III. By the death of his father, he succeeded to the earldom at an early age, and by his birth, he belonged of course to the house of Lancaster, whose claims to the English crown were so zealously disputed with the rival family of York. When, in May, 1471, the adherents of the former line were defeated at the battle of Tewksbury, the earl of Pembroke, young Richmond's uncle, conveyed his nephew, now about fourteen years of age, to Brittany. But political jealousy may gather strength from the absence of its object; nor, probably, was it without reason that Edward IV., the reigning king of England, and of the family of York, felt suspicious of the youthful exile, to whom—although the very act which rendered his relation to the royal house of Lancaster legitimate, made an exception of *his* particular branch in respect of the succession to the crown—the eyes of the Lancastrian party, in their extremity, appear to have been turned. Edward sought to induce the duke of Brittany to deliver up the earl. This proposal the duke rejected, but, being an ally of Edward, agreed to retain him in custody. The king, however, again applied for the person of Richmond to be given up into his hands, professing an intention that the earl should receive his daughter Elizabeth in marriage. Richmond, accordingly, was about to proceed on his return to the English shore, but, owing, it seems, to a suspicion of the king's intentions timeously occurring to the mind of the duke, the latter still reserved his noble visitor in his own hands. But, after the death of Edward and the usurpation of Richard III. in 1483, the very matrimonial scheme which, with no friendly intention towards the earl perhaps, the former had proposed, was suggested to the duke of Brittany by Bishop Morton, an active supporter of the house of Lancaster. This union, by which the family of York, represented by Elizabeth, could be brought into such intimate connection with that of Lancaster, was agreed to not only by the duke, but also by the queen-dowager, mother of Elizabeth, and the countess of Richmond, mother of the earl, the former of whom made provision for his return, and advised him to levy forces against King Richard—to whose sway she had so much reason to be hostile¹—and, on his arrival in England to enter into the intended marriage with her daughter. Accordingly, he set sail on that expedition, the fortunes of which we have already noticed in our sketch of Richard III. In the battle of Bosworth, Richmond was at last victorious; he was hailed, ere he left the field, with shouts of “Long live Henry VII!” and the crown, which had been worn by Richard in the battle, was placed on his head.²

¹ Many of our readers may remember that scene of Shakspeare—Richard III. Act IV. Scene 4—where an interview between Richard and the queen-dowager, after the loss of her poor princes, Edward V. and the Duke of York, is vividly described. In the course of this scene, wherein the pity and resentment of the bereaved mother are represented, Richard ventures to make proposals to the queen for the hand of her daughter Elizabeth, and at last appears to gain upon her. This incident accords with a historical fact adverted to in the present sketch.

² This last circumstance and the great historical event with which it is connected, may remind some of our readers of the following prediction respecting Richmond when a boy, put into the mouth of Henry VI.—Shakspeare, Henry VI. Act IV. Scene 6:—

Come hither, England's hope, if secret powers
Suggest but truth to my divining thoughts,

It seems unlikely that a character such as that of Richard III., and a throne founded as was that of this infamous usurper, would be able to gain the respect or affection of the people ; nor does it appear very wonderful that Richmond, now in his hopeful prime, crowned with the laurels of his late decisive victory, and destined to a marriage with the heiress of the house of York, should have easily consummated an accession to the throne, notwithstanding the insufficiency of his own individual claims, and the probable superiority in those of the house of York to the rival ones of that of Lancaster. He seems, however, to have ascended the throne with an undue and impolitic degree of opposition to the family of York. He also ventured to put off his marriage with Elizabeth—the event by which he was to unite the families, and thereby strengthen his claims—until he should have been crowned, and had his accession sanctioned by act of parliament. On the 30th of October, the ceremony of coronation was performed by Bouchier, archbishop of Canterbury, who had also crowned the two preceding sovereigns, Edward IV. and Richard III. ; and in the parliament which met, November 7th, a majority appeared to be in favour of the new king, who, in addressing them, adverted to the victory he had lately gained, as well as to his hereditary claims. The act of future succession—which is represented by Mr Hume as drawn up “with sufficient reserve and moderation”—without setting aside the claims of the house of York, or enforcing Richmond’s independent right, was yet so framed as to fix the succession in the heirs of his own body ; and, on his applying, next year, for a papal bull in confirmation of his title, it was readily granted by Pope Innocent VIII. Some of the Yorkists were sentenced by an act of attainder ; but the king published a proclamation offering pardon to those who had opposed him in the field, provided they submitted within a certain time, and took the oath of allegiance to the new government.³ He also conferred favours on certain of his own adherents, restoring to his honours the eldest son of the duke of Buckingham—“the effect,” says Mr Hume, “of his gratitude to the memory of Buckingham, who had first concerted the plan of his elevation, and who, by his own ruin, had made way for that great event.”

In January 1486, a few months after his accession, Henry, according to the wishes of his parliament, married Elizabeth, the daughter of Edward IV. who was not crowned, however, until November 1487. To this princess he seems to have greatly failed in conjugal affection. A disposition such as that which, afterwards at least, marked the character of Henry,—artful, cold, and avaricious,—seems but little consonant with the amiable performance of the duties of domestic life. His remissness in this respect has also been attributed to violent prejudice against the family of York. Nor can it be denied, that at an early period of his reign, there existed in the northern parts of England—to which he at this time made a journey—considerable opposition to the cause of the Lancastrian king. A hostile attempt, however, against

This pretty lad will prove our country’s bliss.
His looks are full of peaceful majesty ;
His head by nature framed to wear a crown,
His hand to wield a sceptre, and himself
Likely in time to bless a royal throne.

³ Rot. Parl.

the authority of Henry, was put down, and on the 20th of September, a foundation was laid for the continuance of the crown in his family, by the birth of a son, to whom, after the British king, he gave the name of Arthur.⁴

This year, however, a formidable insurrection against Henry's authority occurred, headed by Lambert Simnel, an intelligent youth, though of low condition, who acted, in this case, under the direction of Richard Simon, a priest at Oxford. But the influence of persons of higher rank has been supposed to have been at work in this conspiracy; and from the circumstance that Henry, on this occasion, committed his mother-in-law to custody, though under another pretext, that, namely, of having submitted to Richard III. contrary to her promise, it has been inferred that the queen-dowager herself was probably an agent in the case. Simnel started forth in Ireland, where the people were attached to the family of York, professing himself to be the earl of Warwick, a young member of that royal house of whom the king appears to have been peculiarly jealous, and the nearest male heir to the throne. Henry had committed young Warwick to the tower, and on this occasion he sought to convince the people that Simnel's attempt was an imposture, by exhibiting the real earl in London. But Simnel, after being actually treated in Dublin as king, joined not only by Irish troops, but by two thousand veterans sent over by the duchess of Burgundy, aunt of the earl of Lincoln—who, being nephew to Richard III., and, it is supposed, intended by the latter as his successor on the throne, in case of his own previous demise without issue, was naturally in opposition to Henry—landed in Lancashire, and advanced to Stoke in Nottingham. There the rebel troops were met by Henry's army, which proved victorious after an obstinate encounter. Lincoln and other leaders were slain on the field; Simnel received a pardon, and became a menial servant of the king, from which situation he was afterwards advanced to that of falconer. After the battle, Henry made a progress in the northern parts of the kingdom, and penalties, especially fines, were imposed on supporters of the late rebellion: the king "making his revenge," says Mr Hume, "subservient to his avarice."

Henry was now induced to interfere in foreign politics. The king of France, encouraged by the barons of Brittany, having made a formidable invasion on that country, an embassy from France to the English king arrived soon after the battle of Stoke, and sought to induce the latter to remain neutral in the quarrel, if he could not lend to France his positive assistance in its opposition to a court where he had received protection in his youth—representing the war with Brittany as occasioned by that duchy having given shelter to French rebels and fugitives. Henry, for a considerable time, continued to act as a mediator between the parties rather than as an assistant of either. At length the Bretons were routed by the invaders in the battle of St Aubin, and, on the death of the duke of Brittany shortly after, the French set forth a claim to the government of that duchy. Henry was now induced, though with the calculating spirit for which he was remarkable, to send military aid to Brittany, the violated home of his earlier life; and when

⁴ *Lel. Coll.* iv. 204.

King Charles of France had at last succeeded in annexing the duchy to his own kingdom by marriage with the duchess, Henry, in addressing his parliament, which met in October, 1491, represented the king of England as having a claim to the throne of France,—referred to the success of their ancestors at the battles of Crecy and Poitiers and Azincourt, and announced his intention to aim at the sovereignty of that country, which, he told them, had refused to pay a stipulated tribute due to the English nation. These have been considered as vaunting words accommodated to the feelings entertained in England respecting France, now that Brittany had been subdued. But a large supply was granted to the king for carrying on a war with that country,—the nobles enthusiastically entered into the prospect of military honour now brightening before them,—and, on the 6th of October, 1492, Henry, in person, sailed for Calais, with a view, according to his own professions, of subduing France. He did lay siege to Boulogne, but in November concluded a peace, respecting which negotiations had previously taken place. By a stipulation in the treaty, not only were the sums expended by England in support of Brittany to be repaid by France, but to Henry, intent on the gratification of his avarice, and to his heirs, an annual pension of twenty-five thousand crowns was to be paid.

In the course of these protracted operations on the continent, the attempts to collect a subsidy granted in November, 1487, had excited, in the counties of York and Durham, a violent excitement, such as to induce Henry to send down a force, commanded by the earl of Surrey, against the rioters, who were subdued, and, in general, pardoned by the king. But, before his evacuation of France, there arose another hostile attempt, of which the duchess of Burgundy appears as a principal supporter. This was made by a youth named Perkin Warbeck, who sought to have himself considered as none other than Richard, duke of York, son of Edward IV., who was supposed to have been murdered under the direction of Richard III., and whose hereditary claim to the crown, were he alive, might be considered as prior to any that Henry could advance. Warbeck—who is represented as a beautiful and intelligent youth—after advancing his claim in Ireland, went over to the court of France, invited by the sovereign of that country, whose guest he continued to be when the peace was concluded with England in 1492. Henry, at this time, applied to the French monarch for Perkin to be delivered up into his hands. Charles, who had invited the alleged duke of York to France, declined, but agreed to send the adventurer away. Warbeck betook himself to the duchess of Burgundy, who professed to receive his pretensions with distrust, but, at length, embraced him as her nephew, Richard, duke of York. The claims of Warbeck made considerable impression even in England, but the cautious and considerate Henry not only sought to prove, by surviving witnesses, the death of the actual duke of York, but ascertained, by means of spies and bribes, the secret history of the scheme. Sir Robert Clifford, who had supported the pretensions of Warbeck, was gained over by the king, and received a pardon,—but several other English gentlemen, for the same offence, were accused of high treason and condemned; and, after considerable delay, Sir William Stanley, who had been eminently zealous for the king at the battle of

Bosworth, and had been appointed his chamberlain, was condemned and executed,—a monument of the mutability of honour, and of the insecurity of favour in times of political distraction. Perkin escaped a snare laid for him by troops assembled by gentlemen of Kent, but some of those who followed him on the occasion were either killed outright, or tried and put to death. He himself escaped to Flanders, but, leaving that country, came over to Ireland, and thereafter to Scotland, where he was entertained by James IV., and received in marriage a daughter of the earl of Huntly. An aggression, on the part of James, upon the English frontier, in which he was accompanied by Warbeck, was followed by an insurrection in Cornwall, occasioned by Henry's attempt to raise the tribute for the Scottish war. The English insurrection was soon subdued, and the captives were set free; a truce too was formed between Henry and the king of Scotland. But Perkin having been dismissed from that country, betook himself to the south of England, where he was followed by a multitude of the populace, and assumed the title of Richard IV. Military preparations were resorted to on the part of the king; Warbeck's followers submitted, and in general were leniently treated. To Catherine Gordon, the noble lady whom Warbeck had married, the king behaved with liberality. Perkin himself was soon afterwards brought to execution, with the young earl of Warwick, the last of the Plantagenets. The execution of Warbeck may have been blameless,—respecting that of Warwick we quote the words of Hume :—"This violent act of tyranny, the great blemish of Henry's reign, by which he destroyed the last remaining male of the line of Plantagenet, begat great discontent among the people who saw an unhappy prince, that had long been denied all the privileges of his high birth, even cut off from the common benefits of nature, now at last deprived of life itself, merely for attempting to shake off that oppression under which he laboured."

In November 1501, Prince Arthur was married to Catharine, daughter of Ferdinand of Arragon. A few months after this marriage, Arthur died; but Henry, the king's second son, afterwards Henry VIII. was forthwith espoused to the widow of his brother, a measure for which a papal dispensation was obtained. About the same time, Margaret, the king's elder daughter, was married to James, king of Scotland. Elizabeth, Henry's queen, died in February 1503. But neither prosperous nor adverse circumstances seem to have rooted out the avarice of the king. At the beginning of his reign, he had taken as confidential counsellors, two clergymen, Morton and Fox, both of whom were raised to bishoprics. These individuals are said to have kept in check this ruling passion of the king. But we now find him using the aid of two infamous ministers, Empson and Dudley, in supplying his coffers by the oppression of his subjects,—men who appear to have wanted alike the generosity of freemen, and the ordinary sympathies of nature. Under the heavy exactions enforced by their illegal or legalized barbarity, fines and forfeitures supplied the treasury of Henry, who is said to have been in possession, before his death, of the enormous sum of £1,800,000.

In the course of the year 1506, Henry committed to the Tower the earl of Suffolk, nephew of Edward IV. having previously induced Philip of Castile to yield him up into his hands. There is recorded a conversation between these two princes on the subject, to the following

effect. On Henry objecting to the favour which Suffolk—who had engaged in certain unfortunate intrigues—had met with in the dominions of the Castilian king, that prince replied that he supposed the English king had been above being apprehensive of so unimportant a personage as the earl, but promised to banish him from his kingdom. This, however, did not satisfy the jealous mind of Henry,—jealous the more, perhaps, from the consciousness of the attempts which had been made, on his own behalf, against the usurpation of Richard III. He desired of Philip that Suffolk might be delivered into his hands. Philip objected that compliance with this proposal would bring dishonour both on Henry and himself, and produce an impression that the one had treated the other as a prisoner. “I,” said the king, “will take that dishonour on myself, and so your honour is saved.” About the same time Henry formed a treaty with Philip favourable to the commerce of England with Castile, and soon thereafter, betrothed his daughter Mary to the archduke Charles, the son of the Castilian king.

In justice to the English monarch it must be said, that, in the course of his reign, he showed a regard to the interests of maritime discovery and trade. Though contrary to a rule recommended by Montesquieu, that kings should not be merchants, he seems to have himself engaged in commercial enterprise. His celebrated vessel, the Great Harry, is represented as costing fourteen thousand pounds. He invited Columbus to England, when that illustrious navigator had failed of obtaining support from the courts of Spain and Portugal in his proposed adventure; and, although he lost the honour of that discoverer’s success, he sent out Sebastian Cabot on a similar voyage. The commercial laws passed in this reign by parliament, however, were, according to the views of the time, restrictive of perfect freedom in foreign trade. Of the interference on the part of the king and parliament—not very impolitic, perhaps—with another department of the social customs of the commonwealth, the extent of the retinue in a nobleman’s establishment, there is recorded the following rather lively anecdote. On occasion of a visit which Henry paid to his favourite the earl of Oxford, the retainers of that nobleman were drawn up in two lines, and presented a magnificent appearance. The king exalted the earl’s hospitality, suggesting, that the gentlemen and yeomen who appeared before him were, of course, menials of his noble host. Oxford replied that most of them were his retainers, who had come on this occasion to do him service. “By my faith,” exclaimed his majesty, “I thank you for your good cheer, but I must not allow my laws to be broken in my sight! My attorney must speak with you.” The earl is said to have been fined accordingly.

It seems unlikely that the court of Henry would be maintained on *his* part, with any extraordinary splendour. In tilts and tournaments, however—those stern amusements of the age—the king himself took part. Prompted, probably, rather by respect for the Romish church or deference to the papal see, than by religious or romantic ardour, he expressed an interest in a crusade to Palestine in which Pope Alexander VI. exhorted him to join. But his negotiation with the papal nuncio on the subject is marked by the cautious and calculating spirit of the king.

At last, declining health brought him near the termination of his powerful but oppressive reign. His conscience was troubled by the re-

collection of the rapacity which he had countenanced, and his will directed restitution to be made to such as had suffered injury at his hands. He died at Richmond, 22d April, 1509, in the 52d year of his age, and 24th of his reign. His successor, Henry VIII. committed to Pietro Torregiano—a Florentine sculptor, who came to assist in the building of that celebrated edifice, begun by the late king, ‘Henry Seventh’s chapel,’—the erection within its walls, of a tomb to his father’s memory, which, if worthy of the riches which that monarch had amassed, and of the sceptre which he had wielded, may be viewed as also splendidly attesting the insufficiency of both.

Edward Plantagenet

DIED A. D. 1499.

THE melancholy fortunes and fate of this prince form one of the gloomiest pages in English history. After the execution of his father, the duke of Clarence, Edward IV. had created him earl of Warwick. Even Richard, after the death of his own son, had treated him for a time as the heir-apparent, but afterwards, fearing that he might ultimately prove a dangerous competitor, had confined him in the castle of Sheriffhutton, in Yorkshire. The first act of Henry VII. was to transfer the young prince, who had only reached his 15th year, from his prison in the north to the tower of London, a place of greater security for so formidable a personage as the heir to the crown according to the principles of the house of York. The people commiserated the hard lot of the innocent youth, and readily listened to the assurances of an impostor, Ralph Wulford, that the earl of Warwick had escaped from his dismal prison, and was about to re-appear in public and vindicate his injured rights. The committal of Warbeck to the tower precipitated the fate of the last of the Plantagenets. Whether from accident or design, the two prisoners were permitted to see and converse with each other, and concert a plan for their escape. Four of the warders were induced, by liberal promises, to connive at the escape of both prisoners. According to the records of their trial, it was arranged that Warbeck was to be again proclaimed by the title of Richard IV., and Warwick was to summon the retainers of his father to the standard of the new king. On the 21st of November, 1499, two days after the execution of the pretender, the earl of Warwick was brought to trial for treason. Of his own accord he pleaded guilty before a jury of peers, and received sentence of death from the earl of Oxford, as lord-high-steward, which was carried into execution a few days afterwards. Thus perished the last male of the Plantagenets, who had reigned over England for nearly four hundred years. The public voice, as we have already hinted, loudly reprobated Henry’s injustice and inhumanity. For Warwick, confined, as he had ever been, without any legal warrant, was undoubtedly justified in attempting to recover his liberty; and, had he been even guilty of treason, his situation was such as ought to have saved him from punishment. Fifteen years of lonely imprisonment had effectually blighted his moral being. “He was,” says one historian, “a very innocent.”¹ Another contemporary writer says of him,

¹ Holinshed.

"Being kept for fifteen years, without company of men, or sight of beasts, he could not discern a goose from a capon."² But there was more than unjustifiable murder in the deed, foul as it was. "The extinction of such a harmless and joyless life," says Mackintosh, "in defiance of justice, and in the face of mankind, is a deed which should seem to be incapable of aggravation; but the motives of this merciless murder, the base interests to which the victim was sacrificed, and the horrible coolness of the two veteran tyrants who devised the crime, are aggravations perhaps without parallel. Henry had been for some time engaged in a negotiation for the marriage of Arthur, his eldest son, with Catherine, infanta of Spain. In the course of the personal correspondence between the two monarchs,—these two kings understanding each other at half a word,—there were letters shown out of Spain, whereby, in the passages concerning the treaty of marriage, Ferdinand had written to Henry in plain terms, that he saw no assurance of the succession as long as the earl of Warwick lived, and that he was loath to send his daughter to troubles and dangers."

Edmund Dudley.

BORN A. D. 1462.—DIED A. D. 1510.

THIS able, but infamous man, was the son of Sir John Dudley, and was born in 1462. He studied at Oxford, and afterwards removed to Gray's inn, where he attained to such distinguished professional eminence and general reputation that he was introduced to the king's privy council in his 23d year. In 1492, he was employed in negotiating for peace with France, and he was one of those who, in 1499, signed the ratification of a treaty with that country,—a circumstance which sufficiently indicates how well he stood in Henry's good graces at this time. The means by which the cunning lawyer courted the royal favour, were of a most disgraceful kind. It was by carefully noting and ministering to Henry's cupidity, that both Dudley and his companion in infamy, Empson, raised themselves to that pride of place from which they were doomed to be so suddenly precipitated at last. To gratify the royal passion, a system of extortion was employed, "which," says Bacon, "the people,—into whom there is infused, for the preservation of monarchies, a natural desire to discharge their princes, though it be with the unjust charge of their counsellors,—did impute unto Cardinal Morton, and Sir Reginald Bray, who, as it after appeared, as counselors of ancient authority with him, did so second his humours, as nevertheless they did temper them, whereas, Empson and Dudley, that followed, being persons that had no reputation, with him, otherwise than by the servile following of his bent, did not give way only as the first did, but shaped his way to those extremities for which himself was touched with remorse at his death." "They were bold men," he adds, "and careless of fame, and that took toll for their master's grist. Dudley was of good family, eloquent, and one that could put hateful business into good language; but Empson, that was the son of a sieve-maker, triumphed always in the deed done, putting off all other respects whatsoever. These two persons, being lawyers in science, and

² Hall.

privy counsellors in authority, turned law and justice into worm-wood and rapine. For, first, their manner was to cause divers subjects to be indicted for sundry crimes, and so far forth to proceed in form of law; but, when the bills were found, then presently to commit them; and, nevertheless, not to produce them in any reasonable time to their answer, but to suffer them to languish long in prison, and, by sundry artificial devices and terrors, to extort from them great fines and ransoms, which they termed compositions and mitigations. Neither did they, towards the end, observe so much as the half face of justice, in proceeding by indictment, but sent forth their precepts to attack men, and convent them before themselves and some others, at their private houses, in a court of commission; and there used to shuffle up a summary proceeding, by examination, without trial of jury, assuming to themselves there to deal both in pleas of the crown and controversies civil. Then did they also use to enthrall and charge the subjects' lands with tenures *in capite*, by finding false offices, and thereby to work upon them by wardships, liveries, premier seisins, and alienations, being the fruits of those tenures; refusing upon divers pretexts and delays, to admit men to traverse those false offices according to law. Nay, the king's wards, after they had accomplished their full age, could not be suffered to have livery of their lands, without paying excessive fines, far exceeding all reasonable rates. They did also vex men with informations of intrusion upon scarce colourable titles. When men were outlawed in personal actions, they would not permit them to purchase their charters of pardon, except they paid great and intolerable sums, standing upon the strict point of law, which, upon outlawries, giveth forfeiture of goods: nay, contrary to all law and colour, they maintained, the king ought to have the half of men's lands and rents, during the space of full two years, for a pain, in case of outlawry. They would also niffle with jurors, and enforce them to find as they would direct; and, if they did not, convent them, imprison them, and fine them."

In the parliament held in 1504, Dudley was speaker of the house of commons. By Henry's will he was appointed along with sixteen others—amongst whom was his *socius criminis* Empson—one of the examiners who were to make inquisition into such matters as they in their conscience should limit Henry's will might stand charged with, and to make restoration and recompense to all aggrieved parties; these two personages were also named amongst Henry's executors, so that they must have contrived to retain their footing in Henry's esteem to the very last. But that monarch was scarcely in his grave, when both Dudley and Empson were sent to the tower, in order to appease the popular clamour against them. At first it was intended to bring them to trial only for "passing the bounds of their commission, and for stretching laws in themselves very severe;" but when it became evident that nothing short of a capital conviction would satisfy the nation at large in the case of two such notorious offenders, it was judged proper to indict them for a conspiracy, during the last illness of Henry, to seize on London with an armed force, and to assume the powers of government as soon as the king's decease was known. Of this conspiracy, Dudley was convicted at London, on the 16th of July 1509, and Empson, at Northampton, on the 1st of October. Stow informs us that the king was inclined to pardon them, and that a rumour prevailed, that Queen

Catharine had effectually interceded for Dudley. It is certain that the delinquents were suffered to remain in jail till the month of August in the following year, when the king, yielding to the general demand for their execution, ordered them to be beheaded upon Towerhill, which was accordingly done on the 18th of August, 1510. With regard to the specific charge for which they suffered, there appears no sufficient evidence of the crime alleged against these delinquents; and, as Mackintosh observes, "the speedy revisal of the attainders, on the petitions of their sons, seems to show the general belief of the groundlessness of the charge of conspiracy. Still the manner in which, in defiance of all equity and justice, they had ministered to the avarice of the deceased monarch removed them from all sympathy; and no one felt or pronounced their doom to be hard and unmerited."

During his imprisonment in the tower, and perhaps with a view to obtain a favourable consideration of his case from the new sovereign, Dudley wrote and addressed to the king a very extraordinary piece, entitled 'The Tree of the Commonwealth.' The contents of this treatise are, in the author's own words, "First, remembrance of God and the faithful of his holy church, in the which every Christian prince had need to begin. Secondly, of some conditions and demeanours necessary in every prince, both for his honour and assuety of his continuance. Thirdly, of the Tree of the Commonwealth, which teacheth people of every degree, of the condition and demeanours they should be of." This book never reached the king's hands, nor was it ever published, but several copies of it exist in manuscript.³

Henry VIII.

BORN A. D. 1491.—DIED A. D. 1547.

ON the death of Henry VII. in April 1509, the prince, in whom the hereditary claims of his father and mother were combined, succeeded, at the age of eighteen, to the English throne. The accession of the youthful, handsome, and accomplished Henry, gave great satisfaction in the nation,¹ which had so long felt the oppression of a rapacious monarch, in whose title, at the same time, a party in the country seemed little inclined to acquiesce. Bishop Fox, an active counsellor of the late king, had been recommended by him to his son and successor, and now became secretary and privy-seal. But the earl of Surrey proved more accommodating than the bishop to Henry's taste for magnificence and pleasure, and the court became eminent for gaiety and the martial amusements of the time. After the execution of Empson and Dudley, the rapacious ministers of the late king, Henry joined in a war against France with Pope Julius II., who sent him an anointed rose on the occasion. His father-in-law, Ferdinand of Spain, was engaged in the same cause, and gave him instructions as to the mode of making an attack on the neighbouring country. But the Spanish monarch appearing to the marquess of Dorset, who commanded Henry's troops, dis-

³ Biog. Brit.

¹ Herbert, apud Kennet, vol. iii. p. 1.

posed to use them in an interested manner, and the English soldiers having mutinied, the army returned to England. It proved difficult, however, to satisfy Henry, still perhaps a novice in the arts of politics, of the propriety of Dorset's conduct; and, after the death of Pope Julius, and the accession of the illustrious Leo X. in 1519, he engaged in another enterprise against France, notwithstanding the close alliance of Scotland with the country he intended to attack. Besides a naval enterprise, under the command of Sir Edward Howard, and afterwards of Lord Howard, an army was prepared, amounting to 14,000 men; and having directed the earl of Suffolk to be beheaded, and leaving the kingdom under the protection of the queen, Henry, along with many of his nobles, sailed for France, eager, perhaps, in the martial spirit of the time, to join the wreath of personal achievement to the honours of a hereditary crown. He had also contributed supplies for levying an army on the continent. Maximilian, emperor of Germany, failed of collecting the number of troops for which he had engaged, but put himself as an officer in the army of the English king. Henry gained at Guinegate the celebrated battle of Spurs,² and on this, obtained by surrender the wealthy city of Tournay, to which he had laid siege. Although, after the latter event, the king returned home, his anger was excited when he heard that Ferdinand and Maximilian had made peace with France, and that the former even proposed a matrimonial alliance with its royal house for his own son, to whom Henry had looked as the future husband of Mary, his favourite sister. But, on the representations of the duke of Longueville, who had been taken prisoner at the battle of Spurs, a negotiation ended in England making peace with France, and in Henry's sister being married to the king of that country, who died, however, soon after his marriage with the princess, which occurred in October, 1514. Henry had also, the year before, made peace with Scotland, the war with that country ending with the celebrated victory gained at Flodden, by the earl of Surrey, in September, 1513, over the Scottish army under James IV.

Cardinal Wolsey had now for a considerable time been intimately connected with the councils of the English king; and in our memoir of that extraordinary man we shall have a fitting opportunity for exhibiting some of the principal events in Henry's reign a little more in detail; for it has been justly observed, that "the history of England, from 1512 to 1519, is nothing more than the history of Wolsey's insatiable ambition."³ The death of Maximilian in January, 1519, was followed by a competition on the part of the kings of France and Spain for the imperial vacancy. In June, Charles of Spain was elected; but, about the middle of 1520, both of these princes sought an interview with Henry, whose greatness as a monarch, and accomplishments as a man, rendered him not altogether unfit to be a personal and political associate of Charles and Francis, however inferior he may have been to the former in power and prudence, and in literary enthusiasm and liberal patronage to the latter, in whose arms, this very year, the illustrious painter, Leonardo da Vinci, died. Charles, on his way to the Low countries, paid Henry a visit in England, and shortly afterwards, Henry visited the emperor

² So called, it is supposed, from the use which was made of their spurs on the occasion by the French cavalry, who were panic-struck, and took to flight. Herbert, p. 16.

³ Roscoe's *Lives of British Statesmen*.

at Gravelines. On the 30th of May, the English king, with his queen and court, set out to Calais to meet with the king of France, thence he proceeded to Guisnes, and between that town and Ardres, whither Francis came for the meeting with Henry, the two monarchs met in friendly conference, on a scene which, from the magnificence of the occasion, obtained the name of 'the Field of the cloth of gold.' The cautious formality of their mutual visits was at last broken by Francis, much to the satisfaction, it appeared, of the English king. On this occasion, the two monarchs made affectionate presents to each other, and they afterwards joined in tilts and tournaments. A slight circumstance, represented as an instance of delicacy on the part of the English king in the course of this visit to Francis, may be noticed as a becoming incident in a life too remarkable for coarse and offensive exhibitions. When Henry and Francis reviewed a treaty into which they had mutually entered, the English monarch, in reading it aloud, after uttering the words, "I, Henry, king"—stopped short, and adding—"of England," omitted the addition "of France," which kings of England had been wont to use.

But the bond of union between Henry and Francis was not permanently formed. It appears that the latter declined to acquiesce in the decision of the English king respecting the election of the emperor, and also sent the duke of Albany, to whose power in Scotland Henry was opposed, into that country, in which he exercised the regency. On these alleged grounds, Henry declared war against Francis in 1522; and the following year, he sent an army into Scotland, where the war terminated in the final departure of Albany. In his own country, Francis maintained his ground, but making an invasion on Italy, and losing the battle of Pavia, surrendered his person to the adherents of the emperor. Henry had been an ally of Charles in the war, but he and Wolsey entertained some dissatisfaction towards him, and the king of England now sent to Spain making demand of a debt alleged to be due by Charles, who, on his part, expressed displeasure at certain instances of Henry's remissness in the war. Henry also entered into an alliance with the mother of Francis, now regent,—in April, 1527, he joined the king of France himself in sending ambassadors to Charles, requiring him, on payment of 2,000,000 crowns, to deliver up the children of Francis, who had been given as their father's ransom, and to pay his debt to the English king,—and, in September, entered into an agreement with France, in which was renounced the English claim to the government of France.

Henry, who had taken so prominent a part in the political commotions of the continent, had given attention also to the theological convulsion which had taken place in Germany, and had even written a work against Luther, which that Reformer sharply answered, but which earned for its royal author from Leo X. the title of 'Defender of the Faith.'⁴ These circumstances seem as if likely to have proved the auguries of Henry's close and permanent connexion with the papal see. But the characteristic ardour which embarked the king in the defence of Romish doctrines, disposed him, under the influence of directing circumstances, to contend the more warmly against Romish

⁴ Collier's Records, vol. ii. No. 4.—Rym. p. 756.

power; and it happens that the separation of England from the supremacy of the pope—that great event in her national annals—is identified with the private passions of this same orthodox defender of the faith—Queen Catharine having been the wife of Arthur, Henry's brother, previously to her marriage with the king himself, an objection to the legitimacy of this latter union had, on more than one occasion, been proposed. It appears that Henry's favourite author, Thomas Aquinas, had objected to marriage between such near relations as he and Catharine had been. A similar view, the king remarked, was entertained by his confessor. All the English prelates too, except Fisher, bishop of Rochester, agreed that the marriage was unlawful. And to crown all, Anne Boleyn, a maid of honour to Catharine herself, about this time attracted the fancy of the king. For his marriage with Catharine, a papal dispensation had been formerly obtained. In this, however, it is alleged, there were flaws of such a kind that, by the rules of the papal court, it might be recalled. Henry applied to Pope Clement VII. for a divorce. The latter was now a prisoner in the hands of Charles V., but access to him was obtained, and his holiness expressed a willingness to agree to Henry's wish. When at length he had obtained his liberty, he still remained under the influence of Charles, and even showed less readiness in granting the English king's request. At last, however, Clement gave secret instructions for having the validity of the royal marriage inquired into. But Henry's counsellors advised their master not to act on this uncertain and underhand permission, and in February 1528, Stephen Gardiner and Edward Fox, were despatched to Rome to obtain security, if possible, for the pope's adherence to the decision of the commission to whom he had given authority to inquire into the matter. Clement renewed his commission to Wolsey, with whom he now joined Cardinal Campeggio, an adherent of his own. The latter came to England in October, and although he at first attempted to get the scheme of a divorce suppressed, he sought to gratify the king, and even showed at court a papal bull for annulling the marriage with the queen—a document, however, which Campeggio, in the course of events, was directed to destroy. On the 31st of May, 1529, the papal commission proceeded to the trial of the cause, and the royal parties appeared before them. At the opening of the court, Catharine fell at Henry's feet, and made a pathetic expostulation with him on his conduct in wishing to be divided from his tried and faithful queen. She then rose and retired. The king admitted her fidelity before the cardinals, and gave a statement of his reasons for seeking a divorce. The queen was again summoned to appear: but she had appealed to Rome, and did not answer to the citation of the court. It pronounced her contumacious, and proceeded to examine evidence on the matter of debate. The court was prorogued until the beginning of October, but at that time the cause was called to Rome in order to be tried—a measure for securing which the queen had received the emperor's support. Now began Wolsey's overthrow. There is reason to suppose that he was more cautious and less vigorous in gratifying the headstrong passions of the king, than suited the inclination of his master. That master, and his favourite Anne Boleyn, were offended by his conduct respecting an object in which both had such a tender interest; and it is not without reason that, in speaking of this subject, Mr Hume re-

marks—"constant experience evinces how rarely a high confidence and affection receives the least diminution, without sinking into absolute indifference or even running into the opposite extreme." In October, Wolsey was deprived of the great seal,—he was even banished from his house in London. Soon thereafter, the king appeared in some measure to relent, and sent him a ring in token of regard. After his trial and condemnation, both in the Star chamber and in parliament, Henry granted him a pardon, and even after Wolsey's death, appears to have done honour to his memory. Nor surely is it to be wondered at that even in the selfish heart of Henry, some gleams still lingered of the light which he had, perhaps too liberally, cast around the footsteps of his favourite. Yet after all, it was when under arrest on a charge of high treason, founded apparently on Wolsey's opposition to the king's continued efforts at obtaining a divorce, that, in November, 1530, this proud cardinal,—not to say with the chamberlain in Shakspeare, "this bold, bad man,"—expired. In connexion with the history of his royal master, he stands a memorable witness not only of the instability of earthly greatness, but of the passionate energy of Henry's mind, feeling and assuming it as its own prerogative, alike immeasurably, to give or to withdraw its favour :

Pone, meum est, inquit—pono, tristisque recedo.

About the time when the cause of Henry and his queen was withdrawn to the papal court, the former agreed to certain provisions for the regulation of the clergy, passed by parliament, which also, professedly on account of the king's attention and liberality towards the nation, discharged him from the debts he had contracted since his accession to the throne. Besides that a large proportion of the nation seems to have been disposed to support him in his aim at a divorce, it was with great satisfaction that he received the suggestion of Dr Thomas Cranmer, that he should apply for the opinions of the universities of Europe, respecting the validity of the marriage.⁵ The suggestion was adopted; and it is only fair, perhaps, to grant that his favourable inclination towards the plan appears to indicate that he was not without a real misgiving respecting the lawfulness of his union with the queen. The universities were in his favour, as also the convocations of Canterbury and York. A letter of the nobility to his holiness even ventured to warn him that he might find it dangerous to refuse agreement to the proposal of the king. The latter sent reasons, by Anne Boleyn's father, who had now been created earl of Wiltshire, for declining to appear by proxy, according to the summons of the pope; and it is remarked, that the earl declined to kiss the foot of his holiness. By the convocation which met at the beginning of the year 1531, and in which the ecclesiastics, who had submitted to the legantine court of Wolsey, condemned by this time as unlawful, agreed to purchase a pardon of Henry, the king was pronounced 'Head of the church of England.'⁶ After being importuned by the commons, 'from his own goodness,' as he himself professed, he pardoned the laity for their submission to Wolsey's court. The following year an act was passed, for withholding from the court of Rome the first-fruits, which had been accustomed to

⁵ Rymer, vol. xiv. p. 390.—Burnet.

⁶ Burnet.

be paid: power, however, being left with the king to suspend the law, if he should please. This was a bold stroke at the long-established authority of the pope; and such was Henry's disposition towards the papal power, that it now lost him the services, as lord chancellor, of that accomplished scholar, but bigotted Romanist, Sir Thomas More. The king continued to decline appearing, by proxy, before his holiness, alleging the insufficiency of a proxy to represent him in this matter of conscience, and the danger of permitting appeals to be carried from his own kingdom—the doing of which, in cases of matrimony and other ecclesiastical causes, was prohibited, the following year, by act of parliament. After the private celebration of a marriage with Anne Boleyn, who had now been created marchioness of Pembroke, the king publicly acknowledged the union, in April, 1533. Soon thereafter Anne was crowned, and, 7th September, was delivered of a daughter. The marriage had been previously confirmed by Cranmer, now archbishop of Canterbury, who had also, after an examination of the previous one with Catharine, declared the latter to be invalid, and who now, at the desire of the king, stood godfather to the royal infant.

Henry, before his marriage with Anne, had held an interview with the king of France, on the cause at issue. That prince made an attempt to mediate between his holiness and the English king, and Henry agreed to submit his cause to the court at Rome, if the cardinal, attached to the emperor, Catharine's brother, should be excluded. But his written promise on the subject being detained beyond the time prescribed, and a report having gone to Italy that ridicule had been cast on the pope and cardinals in a ludicrous exhibition represented before the English king, the consistory, 23d March, 1534, declared Catharine to be Henry's lawful wife, and the king excommunicated, should he refuse obedience to the decision of the court. This was a decisive step on the part of Rome, and similarly decisive was the conduct of the king and his obedient parliament. This year he received the title of 'only supreme head on earth of the church of England;' the authority of the pope, who had issued bulls, however, for Cranmer's appointment to the archbishopric of Canterbury, was annulled, and the succession was removed from Mary, Henry's daughter by Catharine, and settled on the issue of the new queen. Severity was resorted to, in enforcement of the innovation respecting the supremacy: for their resistance to which, Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More were brought to trial, condemned and executed, in 1535. At the beginning of the following year, Catharine—to whom the king had given the title of princess-dowager of Wales, and from whom he had ordered the honours appropriate to royalty to be withheld—died at Kimbolton, after a lingering illness. Shortly before her death she had written a letter to the king, expressing forgiveness and affection, and commending their daughter Mary to his kindness,—a document by which the king is said to have been moved to tears, though Anne, who was shortly after delivered of a still-born son, is represented as expressing pleasure on occasion of her rival's death.

But the year which opened on the death-bed of Catharine was to close over the grave of Anne, whose melancholy fate will be related at

length, in our memoir of that unfortunate woman. Henry had fixed his affections on another lady,⁸ Jane Seymour, a maid of honour to the queen. Anne was beheaded on the 19th of May,—another victim to the impetuous passions of the man whom, almost immediately before her death, she called ‘a most merciful and gentle prince.’ With disgusting want of decency, he, next day, consummated a marriage with Jane Seymour, which he represented to parliament as entered into for their benefit. They confirmed the divorce from Anne, and set aside the claim of the issue of the marriage with that unfortunate queen, as well as of the previous one with Catharine, to the succession, which was settled on Henry’s children by Jane Seymour. They also increased his personal prerogative, continuing that course of accordance with Henry’s capricious will which marked the proceedings of his parliaments. The king had by this time suppressed the monasteries whose annual revenues were under £200, the property of which was transferred to the king. But, according to the image of Bishop Fisher, in speaking of the subject, “the axe had got a handle, and proceeded to cut down the cedars.” Notwithstanding a revolt both in Lincolnshire and in the north of England, one of the grounds of which was Henry’s conduct in reference to the monastic houses, he now betook himself, with the rude energy by which his character is marked, to the suppression of the greater ones, in which, as well as in the others, great immorality appears to have been practised. The annual revenue accruing to the crown, from the multitude of monasteries and other ecclesiastical houses suppressed by Henry, amounted to upwards of £160,000.⁹ The proceeding was a very bold, and perhaps an unadvised, one; but a proportion of the revenue was granted by the king towards erecting bishoprics, and forming pensions for abbots and priors, deprived, by the suppression, of their former income. His favourites also shared in the spoil; he sold or exchanged on terms disadvantageous to the crown; and he is said to have paid a cook, who pleased him by a pudding, with the revenue of a convent.

But Henry had not renounced the theological doctrines of the Romish church along with the supremacy of its acknowledged head. Persons maintaining articles of the reformed faith were even subjected to severe persecutions, and when the king, in 1535, requested a visit from Melancthon and others of the foreign reformers, it was intimated to him, that his severity to Protestants destroyed his claim to be considered a sound Protestant prince. That year, however, Coverdale’s translation of the Bible was published, with a dedication to the king, and, in 1536, it was ordered to be used in churches. About the same time, the convocation framed a body of theological articles, in some degree inclining to the protestant belief, though not without a considerable proportion of the Romish creed. In 1538, Henry aimed at a union with the German Protestants, and in the following year was published a new translation of the Bible, undertaken, some years before, by the convocation of the church, notwithstanding the publication of Tindal’s improved version, which was rejected by the ecclesiastics as not sufficiently correct. On the title-page of the new translation, the king, according

⁸ Herbert, ii.

⁹ There were suppressed in this reign 645 monasteries, having 28 abbots in parliament, 90 colleges, 2,374 chapels and chantries, 110 hospitals.

to a design attributed to Hans Holbein, was represented as delivering the Bible into the hands of Archbishop Cranmer and of Thomas Cromwell, for distribution—as the design has been explained—among the clergy and the laity.¹⁰ The reformer, Tindal, however, had suffered at the stake, in 1536, betrayed, it is alleged, to the procurator of the emperor of Germany, by a man employed by Henry and his council, and had died, with these words upon his lips—"Lord, open the king of England's eyes!" But Henry continued, in his doctrinal creed, a Romanist; he cautioned the people respecting the use of the new translation of the Bible; and, in 1538, he even met, in theological debate, with a schoolmaster of the name of Lambert, with whom he entered into public disputation, at Westminster, respecting the real presence in the eucharist, and who, after a long debate, supported by several of the bishops, was sentenced by Thomas Cromwell, who was soon after created earl of Essex, and who, on this occasion, in a letter to Sir Thomas Wyat, thus describes the part taken by his master, in the interview with Lambert:—"It was a wonder to see how princely, with how excellent gravity and inestimable majesty, his highness exercised there the very office of supreme head of the church of England. How benignly his grace essayed to convert the miserable man; how strong and manifest reasons his highness alleged against him. I wish the princes and potentates of Christendom to have had a meet place to have seen it. Undoubtedly they should have much marvelled at his majesty's most high wisdom and judgment, and reputed him no otherwise after the same, than, in a manner, the mirror and light of all other kings and princes in Christendom." The Romish doctrine of the presence in the eucharist seems to have been one of which Henry was particularly jealous; but, in 1539, it was combined with five others, in the celebrated 'Six Articles,' called by protestants, 'the Bloody bill,' which parliament passed, in conformity, we may well suppose, to the inclinations of the king. A signal monument truly, of the "benignity and most high judgment and wisdom" of this "mirror and light of all other kings and princes in Christendom!" The other articles enforced by this infamous bill, besides the real presence, were, communion in one kind, private masses, the celibacy of the clergy, vows of chastity, and auricular confession. For the trial of persons accused of Protestant heresy on these points the king was to appoint a commission; and, by the same parliament, his proclamation was ordained to have the force of statute laws. The 'Six Articles' were warmly opposed by Archbishop Cranmer; but on the passing of the bill, he sent back his wife, the daughter of a foreign protestant, to Germany, and retired from court. The king, however, sent Essex and Norfolk to condole with him.

In October, 1538, on the birth of his son, Prince Edward, the king had lost his favourite queen, Jane Seymour,—immediately after which event he bethought himself of entering into another marriage. This was effected, sixth January, 1540, with Anne of Cleves, but in circumstances that augured little for the matrimonial happiness of either of the parties. Henry had previously set his affections on the duchess-

¹⁰ The central part of the design on this admired title-page has been copied into Mr Thomson's *Illustrations of British History*, vol. i., and is animated and striking. On occasion of Queen Mary's marriage with Philip, her father, Henry VIII., was publicly represented with a Bible in his hand, but the painter was directed to exchange the Bible for a pair of gloves.

dowager of Longueville, whom he found to be betrothed to his nephew, James of Scotland, and had also failed of inducing the king of France to meet him at Calais, in company with the two sisters of the duchess, and other distinguished ladies, from among whom he proposed, in this way, to select a consort. He at last made choice of a daughter of the Duke of Cleves, recommended to his favour by a portrait of her, executed by Hans Holbein. But on meeting her at Rochester, Henry was disappointed with his intended queen. It was thought inexpedient, however, to break off the matrimonial scheme, and the marriage was consummated. The princess had been proposed to the king by Cromwell. Henry, notwithstanding his disappointment, continued that minister in the office of vicar-general. But on the 28th of July, 1540, Essex, lately the object of his master's patronage, became, by his death, the victim of his master's severity. "The king's wrath" was "like arrows of death."

But Henry had now another measure in his eye. He represented a matrimonial contract as having passed before his marriage, between Anne and the duke of Lorraine—a scheme, however, which appears to have been annulled; and he also declared that he himself had failed of an inward assent to his union with Anne. From the convocation he obtained a divorce, to which the queen herself, with prudence, perhaps, if not with dignity, agreed; and on the 8th of August he was married to Catharine Howard. This union with the Catholic house of Norfolk was followed by a severe persecution of the Protestants. Persons of the other party also suffered; and shortly before the marriage of the king, one of those tragical deaths, by which, in the course of his impetuous career, persons of illustrious rank and character were publicly cut off, was consummated in the case of the countess of Salisbury, mother of Cardinal Pole—a man who, by birth related to the king, had once been a sharer in his patronage and favour, but who, supporting the papal court in the cause of the king's divorce from Catharine, and expressing himself in terms unfavourable to Henry, had incurred his warm displeasure, and encouraging, it seems, a party against Henry in England, to which the countess, naturally enough, belonged, may be said, perhaps, to have been punished in the person of his mother, who suffered on the scaffold, 27th May, 1540. A similar fate was in reserve for the favourite queen herself. That Catharine Howard was guilty of wounded honour before her marriage with the king, seems satisfactorily proved; and, perhaps, her wedded life was not utterly unstained. On hearing allegations against her purity, Henry appeared to be greatly moved. Barbarous as he was in some respects, this was a matter that touched him keenly; to virgin purity he paid particular regard. The guilty and unfortunate Catharine was tried, condemned, and, along with Lady Rocheford, put to death in 1542.

This year Henry obtained the title of 'King of Ireland.' He also published a declaration of reasons for making war with Scotland—complaining that his nephew, James V., had failed of meeting him in a conference the year before, according to his promise, kept back a portion of English territory, and afforded protection to unfaithful English subjects. He even claimed submission as liege lord of the Scottish king. In spite of the remonstrances of James, war was carried to the Scottish frontier under the duke of Norfolk; but James died in Decem-

ber, soon after the battle of Solway, in which several of his nobility were taken prisoners. On the death of the king of Scotland, Henry proposed a marriage between Edward, his son by Jane Seymour, and his late nephew's infant daughter, Mary. But Cardinal Beaton, regent of Scotland, was opposed to the match, and a war ensued, in which Henry's troops supported the party of the earl of Lennox against the cardinal. In June, 1546, peace was concluded with Scotland, and also with the king of France.

Henry had now become the subject of disease, and Bishop Gardiner, so notorious from the part which he took in the persecution of the following reign, was his minister. Even now, persecution—from which, indeed, the previous part of Henry's reign had been by no means free—darkened this closing period of his life. Catharine Parr, whom Henry had married on the 12th July, 1543, was in danger of falling before the temper of her lord. She was attached to the Protestant religion, and, in a conversation with the king, ventured to differ with him in an article of faith. But heresy and contradiction were too much for him to bear. He informed Bishop Gardiner of the queen's offence, and even authorised articles of impeachment to be prepared against her—as if it were a matter of course, that to be the wife of Henry was, in the end, to be the victim of his cruelty. But Catharine, hearing of her danger, effectually soothed and pacified him, commending his theological capacity, and speaking humbly of herself. The bloody actions of Henry's reign were not yet terminated however, nor was it until the duke of Norfolk had been condemned, and his celebrated and accomplished son, the earl of Surrey, by a sentence which none, perhaps, will justify, had lost his life, that Henry yielded up his own. His health had long been giving way, and his malady seems to have roused to savage passion a temper ill-prepared, perhaps, by courtly flattery and parliamentary submission, for a personal encounter with an enemy which the power of the tyrant was unable to subdue. On hearing that death might be looked for, he directed Cranmer to be sent for; and the latter having asked him to give a sign of his dying in the faith, Henry pressed the hand of the prelate, and expired. This event occurred on the 28th of January, 1547, in the 56th year of the king's age, and 38th of his reign.

This prince—whose character history brings the more prominently out, from the vigorous part he took, and the powerful influence he exerted, in the transactions of his reign—appears not only to have encouraged art and genius, but to have been himself possessed of considerable accomplishment and learning. But along with his attainments, there is indicated a dogmatic confidence in his own conclusions—at least in matters of theology—founded, probably, both on his notions of prerogative as a king, and head of the English church, and on a vain opinion of his own capacity. He was possessed, no doubt, of great activity and energy of mind; but these were frightful weapons in the hands of a despot, and might have proved so even in the hands of a wiser and better man possessed of the prerogative wielded by the English king. But Henry did not act merely under the influence of short and violent excitement. Wolsey, who had opportunity to know him well, thus described him shortly before his own death:—"He is a prince of a most royal carriage, and hath a princely heart; and rather than he will miss or want any part of his will, he will endanger the one

half of his kingdom. I do assure you, that I have often kneeled before him, sometimes three hours together, to persuade him from his will and appetite, but could not prevail." To his country he stands in the relation of the prince under whom the English church was severed from the supremacy of Rome, and the Holy Scriptures opened up for the use of the English people. But the probable sincerity of his adherence to the Romish dogmas, and the false opinions of the age respecting the treatment of errors in theological belief, are unable to remove from his memory the stain of religious persecution—and, although the part which he took in setting aside the papal claim to the supremacy in England, may have found support in conclusions to which reason, guided by the circumstances in which his wish for a divorce from Catharine had placed him, yet, considering the headstrong passions of the king, and the relation into which he was brought with the pope, by his suit for a divorce, there is reason to regard his conduct in the matter a proof neither of sound and deliberate thought on the real subject of the supremacy, nor of a generous wish to establish truth, though new, on the ruins of antiquated error. During Henry's life, the English government ill kept pace with the growth of religious reformation under the great men who led the march of protestantism on the continent of Europe—and much as, in point of fact, Henry may have done to bring on in England the ascendancy of truth, yet he does not, as its wise and generous advocate, stand forth,

" His own brows garlanded,
Amid the tremor of a realm aglow,
Amid a mighty nation jubilant."

In many respects, the reign of this monarch is deserving of careful study, and the great men who flourished in it have not only a strong but a peculiar claim on our attention. They performed a work of much difficulty, and established principles which indicate the rapid advancement of knowledge and good sense. Nor is it only from the position in which they stood as to the affairs of their own times, that the actors on the stage of public events at this period merit so much observation. They were the forerunners of a yet hardier generation,—of men who had a far more difficult task to perform, who stood surrounded by circumstances which it required higher intellects to govern and more light to convert into good, but who were yet indebted in many important respects to their predecessors. It is with an eye to subsequent eras that every division of biographical history should be made: there is however a stronger, a more evident relationship between following ages at one period than at another. The most ingenious minds will find it difficult to trace the progress of improvement by that of time through the general course of events: it is only here and there that the cause and the effect may be seen hanging together in the misty regions of the past; but wherever even the faintest signs of the connexion are discoverable, there both history and biography assume a dignity which raises them far above their ordinary respectability and usefulness.

Cardinal Wolsey.

BORN A. D. 1471.—DIED A. D. 1530.

THOMAS WOLSEY was born at Ipswich, in Suffolk, in the month of August, some say March, 1471. A controversy has arisen among his biographers as to the rank in life and occupation of this celebrated man's father. We are neither able nor solicitous to determine the point. Cavendish describes him as "an honest poor man's son," and the designation is sufficient to show that Wolsey added to his other merits the no small one of having raised himself to the most exalted eminence which a subject could occupy from an humble and obscure station. His father appears to have possessed a little property, which enabled him to enter his son at Magdalene college, Oxford, where he obtained the degree of bachelor-in-arts at the early age of fifteen. To quickness of apprehension, the young Wolsey added considerable personal qualifications. Shakspeare says of him, that "he was fashioned to much honour from the cradle;" and to this union of intellectual and bodily qualities he may have been indebted for much of the favour and patronage which were shown to him in early life. He was early elected fellow of Magdalene, and, having been subsequently admitted to orders, was appointed master of the preparatory school of his college. The assiduity and success with which, in this character, he conducted the preliminary education of the three sons of Grey, marquess of Dorset, procured for him the patronage of that nobleman, who presented him with the living of Lymington in Hampshire.

Wolsey was in his 29th year when he obtained this his first church-preferment. Before he left the university, he had given solid proof not only of his literary tastes and acquirement, but of his munificence and genius for architecture. The erection of the fine tower of Magdalene college chapel had demonstrated the justness of his taste, but had, at the same time, involved him in pecuniary embarrassments to a considerable extent. Yet no sooner was the young incumbent settled in his rectory than he began to repair and beautify both his church and parsonage house, in a style which would have better suited the mansion of a nobleman than the residence of a country clergyman. So early did the love of architecture display and manifest itself as a master-passion in Wolsey's mind. The marquess of Dorset died in 1501, but Wolsey quickly found another patron in Deane, archbishop of Canterbury, into whose household he was received as domestic chaplain. The archbishop died in 1502, and Wolsey next acquired the favour of Sir John Nanfan, treasurer to the city of Calais, who, upon retiring from office on the score of old age, recommended Wolsey so warmly to the notice of Henry VII., that the king made him one of his chaplains.

Wolsey had now entered on the high road to preferment, and, with that quick discernment and tact for which he was afterwards so conspicuous, he immediately attached himself to the bishop of Winchester and Sir Thomas Lovel, two of the most influential members of Henry's privy council. By studying the temper of these two courtiers, and accommodating himself to their wishes, he raised himself so high in their good opinion, that they did not hesitate to recommend him to

the king, then contemplating a marriage with the duchess of Savoy, as a fit person for conducting the necessary negotiations with Maximilian, emperor of Germany, the father of the duchess. "The king," says Cavendish, "giving ear unto them, and being a prince of excellent judgment and modesty, commanded them to bring his chaplain, whom they so much commended, before his Grace's presence. At whose repairs thither, to prove the wit of his chaplain, the king fell in communication with him in matters of weight and gravity; and perceiving his wit to be very fine, thought him sufficient to be put in trust and authority with this embassy, and commanded him to prepare himself for this enterprise and journey, and for his depeche to repair to his Grace, and his trusty counsellors aforesaid, of whom he should receive his commission and instructions; by means whereof he had then a due occasion to repair from time to time to the king's presence, who perceived him more and more to be a very wise man, and of a good entendement." The expedition and address with which Wolsey acquitted himself in this negotiation, justified the high encomiums which had been pronounced upon him by his friends, Fox and Lovel, and effectually established him in Henry's favour, who rewarded him with the deanery of Lincoln, at that time the most valuable benefice in England under a bishopric, to which were added the prebends of Stowe, Walton, and Brinkald.

Soon after the commencement of Henry the Eighth's reign, we find Wolsey executing the office of king's almoner, an office which gave him every opportunity of ingratiating himself with the monarch. Nor was he long in turning the advantages of his situation to his own profit. In a very few months he had acquired the complete confidence of his royal master, and had rendered himself so subservient to his pleasures, that Henry rewarded him with the splendid mansion and gardens of Sir Richard Empson, which, on the attainder of that minister, had fallen to the crown. This palace was for some years the scene of Wolsey's magnificence and Henry's sports. Here the young monarch, with his gay companions, sought relief from the cares of state in the most unbounded revelry and licentiousness; and here Wolsey, abandoning all decorum, sang, danced, and caroused with the youthful debauchees. "He came unto the king," says Tyndale, "and waited upon him, and was no man so obsequious and serviceable, and in all games and sports the first and next at hand, and as a captain to encourage others, and a gay finder-out of new pastimes, to obtain favour with all. He spied out the nature and disposition of the king's playfellows, and of all that were great, and whom he spied meet for his purpose, him he flattered and made faithful with great purposes." Nor was he less sedulous to win the esteem and friendship of such ladies as stood well in the youthful monarch's good graces. "Whosoever of them was great," says Strype, "to her he was familiar, and gave her gifts." By such arts, Wolsey, at once established himself in Henry's favour, as a prime accessory to his pleasures, whilst he not only gave no offence to those who might otherwise have become his rivals, but actually won them over to his own interests. At the same time he endeavoured to convince Henry that he was equal to greater things than promoting courtly revelry and giving a zest to a monarch's hours of relaxation. By frequent disquisitions on the works of the school-

men, and particularly of Aquinas, Henry's especial favourite, and on the theory and art of government, he succeeded in impressing his young pupil with a high sense of his skill both as a politician and a divine. In this way he gradually acquired a wonderful dominion over the youthful king's mind, and became at last the most influential personage in the whole circle of Henry's accomplished courtiers. He now wanted nothing "either to please his fantasy, or to lavish his coffers, fortune so smiled upon him,"—he was the sole avenue to Henry's favour, and suitors of every rank found it for their interest to propitiate Wolsey in the first instance, and make their first approaches through him. The two rival ministers, Surrey and Fox, quailed before his ascendancy; and Margaret of Scotland and Queen Catharine herself found it for their advantage to keep on good terms with the all-powerful almoner.

Soon after the king's return from the campaign in France, the bishopric of Lincoln happened to become vacant, and was given to Wolsey, who, on taking possession, found his wealth much augmented by the moveables of his predecessor; he had been scarcely invested with this new honour, when York also became vacant, and he was advanced to the archiepiscopal dignity. Little more than a year elapsed before Wolsey was advanced to the rank of cardinal by Leo X. Archbishop Warham now relinquished the seals, which were instantly given to the cardinal with the dignity of chancellor of the realm. "Henceforth," says Galt, "Wolsey may be regarded as the dictator of England; for, although the king appeared, afterwards, personally in every important transaction, the cardinal had acquired such an ascendancy that the emanations of the royal will were in fact only the reflected purposes of the minister." A bull investing him with legantine authority, placed his ecclesiastical pre-eminence in the realm above controversy, and invested him with the prerogatives of the pontiff himself.¹ Francis I. being now desirous of entering into an alliance with England, had recourse to bribery to win the interest of the cardinal. Charles V. of Germany, Pope Leo, and the duke of Milan, successively resorted to the same means with a view to the same end. In addition to the annuities settled upon him by these potentates, Wolsey farmed the revenues of the sees of Hereford and Worcester from the foreign dignitaries upon whom they had been bestowed, and held in commendam the abbey of St Alban's with the bishopric of Bath. What the arts were by which the crafty favourite continued to apologise to his royal master for his avariciousness, and above all to lull his suspicions of foreign influence, does not clearly appear; one thing is certain, that not only did the unscrupulous monarch connive at his minister's conduct, but he even sanctioned it, and seemed to be much amused at the adroitness with which Wolsey managed his own interest in every negotiation. On being informed that Francis I. had settled an annuity of 12,000 livres on the cardinal, he only observed to Wolsey himself, "I plainly discern that you will govern both Francis and me." So astonishing did this entire ascendancy over the capricious monarch appear even at the time, that the vulgar of the day universally ascribed it to demoniacal influence. But ample as Wolsey's revenues were, they did not more than suffice

¹ Rymer, xiii. 734.

for the enormous expenses of his establishment. His establishment was on a princely scale, and comprehended no fewer than eight hundred individuals. His personal attendants were forty-six in number, and his chaplains and other attendants upon the ceremony of mass, not fewer than 143. Many of the officers of his household were persons of considerable birth and liberal education, and afterwards rose to high offices in the state. In his own person he exhibited the utmost richness and magnificence of attire: his very shoes, according to Roy, being

“Of gold and stones precious,
Costing many a thousand pounds.”

When he went abroad he appeared with more than royal splendour and parade. “There was borne before him,” says Cavendish, “first the great seal of England; and then his cardinal’s hat, by a nobleman or some worthy gentleman, right solemnly, bareheaded. And as soon as he was entered into his chamber of presence, where there was attending his coming to await upon him to Westminster hall, as well noblemen and other worthy gentlemen, as noblemen and gentlemen of his own family; thus passing forth with two great crosses of silver borne before him; with also two great pillars of silver, and his pursuivant-at-arms with a great mace of silver gilt. Then his gentlemen and ushers cried and said, ‘On, my lords and masters, on before! Make way for my lord’s Grace!’ Thus passed he down from his chamber through the hall; and when he came to the hall door, there was attendant for him his mule trapped altogether in crimson velvet and gilt stirrups. When he was mounted, with his cross bearers, and pillar bearers, also upon great horses trapped with fine scarlet, then marched he forward, with his train and furniture in manner as I have declared, having about him four footmen, with gilt poleaxes in their hands; and thus he went until he came to Westminster hall door. And there alighted, and went after this manner, up through the hall into the chancery; howbeit he would most commonly stay a while at a bar, made for him, a little beneath the chancery (on the right hand) and there commune sometime with the judges, and sometime with other persons. And that done he would repair into the chancery, sitting there till eleven of the clock, hearing suitors, and determining of divers matters. And from thence he would divers times go into the star-chamber, as occasion did serve; where he spared neither high nor low, but judged every estate according to their merits and deserts.” Indeed, in the discharge of his judicial functions, Wolsey appears to have been highly exemplary. He did not possess much technical knowledge or acquaintance with the minutiae of law, but with a clear head and vigorous understanding seldom failed to expiscate the merits of a case and arrive at a sound decision, and the equity of his judgments seems to have been universally acknowledged. His jurisdiction over the priesthood was less generally approved of. He instituted a kind of inquisitorial court whose business it was to look after the delicts of the clergy and impose suitable fines upon offenders, and its awards were always strictly executed, which greatly exasperated the clergy against the founder.

Wolsey now became an aspirant after the pontificate, and to this splendid expectation he sacrificed his integrity as Henry’s minister. Galt denies this: and asks what serious effect could be expected from

any promise which Charles might hold out to this effect during his visit to England, seeing that Leo X. who then filled the chair of St Peter, was in the prime of life, and many years younger than the cardinal. Our answer is, that no object whatever could appear too distant or unattainable to Wolsey's insatiable ambition, and that the affair of the interview at Guisnes is decisive of the character of Wolsey in this respect. Leo died in the vigour of his age, but the emperor failed to redeem his pledge, yet his consummate dissimulation prevailed on Wolsey once more to attach himself to his interests in the hope of ere long gaining the object of his aspirations, on the death of the new pope, Adrian VI., whose great age and infirmities rendered that event extremely probable at no distant date. Adrian died in about a year and a half after his election, and Wolsey again felt the triple crown encircling his brows, but was doomed again to experience the hollowness of Charles's protestations: with the support of the imperial party the cardinal De Medici was elected pope under the title of Clement VII.; and England soon after entered into a close alliance with France; though not before Wolsey had pocketed a bribe of one hundred thousand crowns from Francis, under the name of arrears due on the Tournay pension. The home-administration of Wolsey displays greater firmness and integrity; yet his financial measures were not only unpopular, but, in some instances, highly unconstitutional. On his repulse in the house of commons and at the hands of Sir John More, then speaker, Wolsey did not summon a parliament for seven years after, although the very next year was distinguished by the audacious attempt to levy a subsidy of one-sixth of every man's substance. The simple edict of the executive was considered by Wolsey authority sufficient for the execution; but "the courage and love of freedom natural to the English commons, speaking in the hoarse voice of tumult,"³ defeated the daring attempt. His attack on the wealth and endowments of the church was more popular and therefore more successful. In two years he dissolved forty-one of the lesser monasteries, and would have proceeded to greater lengths, had he not been held in check by Henry, who was not yet prepared for such sweeping measures as he himself afterwards adopted against monastic institutions. With the means thus supplied him, Wolsey became a munificent and enlightened patron and supporter of literature and popular education. He established a school and made arrangements for a college at Ipswich; he founded the magnificent college of Christ's church at Oxford; and extended his patronage generally to the universities and places of public instruction throughout England. He also bestowed the most minute and sedulous attention on the education of the duke of Richmond, Henry's natural son, and the princess Mary. These were services which throw a lustre around this extraordinary man's character; but they were hardly appreciated at the time, and whatever they might have done for Wolsey's popularity, the harshness and sternness with which he enforced his home-administration, throughout every department of it, rendered him exceedingly unpopular. The prohibition of games of chance, and his severe sumptuary laws, were highly disrelis:-

³ Hallam.

ed; and the cardinal's own magnificence and licentiousness stood in most unfavourable contrast with such attempts to reform and correct abuses in the private economy of families. "He who grudges every man his pleasure," said the people, "spares not his own." Wolsey displayed less than his usual prudence in the share which he took in the Lutheran controversy. By causing Pope Leo's bull against Luther to be posted on every church door in England, along with the forty-two 'damnable and pestiferous' errors of that great reformer, he in effect did more to promote the cause of the Reformation than many of its best friends could accomplish at the time. Luther knew his man, and hesitated not to designate him in his 'Apologetical letter' to Henry, as "*illud monstrum et publicum odium Dei et hominum, cardinalis Eboracensis, pestis illa regni tui.*" Yet, it must be allowed on behalf of Wolsey, that he did not use his power in a very sanguinary manner against the reformers, and that, in fact, his remissness in searching out and punishing heretics formed one ground of impeachment against him.

We have already hinted at the connexion betwixt the affair of Henry's divorce from Queen Catharine and Wolsey's downfall. We are not prepared to state with certainty what were the precise sentiments which the cardinal entertained respecting that measure; but from Wolsey's behaviour on the occasion of its first communication to him, it would appear that he foreboded from the first that such a step on the part of the king would prove fatal to himself at least. "The cardinal," says Galt, "fell on his knees, and entreated the king to abandon a design so hostile to the faith of which he was the declared champion and defender." Yet both the queen and her nephew, the emperor Charles, charged Wolsey with having originated the divorce indirectly through the bishop of Tarbes. "Of this trouble," old Hall makes the queen to say, "I may only thank you my lord cardinal of York; for, because I have wondered at your high pride and vain glory, and abhor your voluptuous life, and little regard your presumptuous power and tyranny, therefore of malice you have kindled this fire and set this matter abroad, and in especial for the great malice that you bear to my nephew the emperor, because he would not satisfy your ambition and make you pope by force." The appointment of Wolsey and Campeggio, by a papal bull, as a legatine court to try the question of the divorce, sealed the minister's fate. After long vacillation, the two legates avoided coming to a decision by adjourning the legatine court. The impatient spirit of Henry was now provoked to the uttermost, while both Catharine and Anne declared that they regarded the cardinal as their personal enemy, and expected not to receive justice at his hands. The first decided intimation which Wolsey received of the altered terms upon which he now stood with the king, was the marked coldness of his reception at Grafton, where the court rested, on his going thither with Campeggio who had now determined to return to Rome. On his return to London, he opened the court of chancery with his accustomed parade; but the next morning he was waited on by the dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, who demanded the great seals from him. With this demand he refused to comply without a formal letter to that effect from the king himself; but two days afterwards, the dukes returned, and presenting a

written order from Henry, bore away the seals. Wolsey now retired to Esher; but not before he had made some miserable exhibitions of abject submission towards the tyrant

“Whose smile was transport, and whose frown was fate,”

An information was now filed against him by the attorney-general for having, contrary to the statute of provisors, exercised legatine authority in England; he was at once pronounced guilty on this charge, and declared to have incurred the penalties of a premunire; his immense property was seized; and he was hurled from the highest pinnacle of wealth and grandeur to instantaneous and utter destitution. Wolsey held a dispensation under the king's sign manual for the very facts on which he was sued, but having been seized with his other effects, it was now withheld from him, and he was thus prevented from pleading an instrument which must have protected him wherever law or reason could make their voice heard. A transient gleam of sunshine once more lighted up his fallen fortunes. Henry in a fit of pity for his ex-minister, granted him a free pardon and reinstated him in the sees of York and Winchester. Wolsey's characteristic love of splendour was again enkindled, and he was preparing to be enthroned at York when his final arrest for high treason, by the command of his capricious sovereign, took place at Cawood. This last shock was too much for a heart already broken with indignities and dangers: his moral fortitude forsook him; and before the train which had been sent to escort him to the Tower reached Leicester, the hand of death pressed heavily upon him. By great care he was brought to the abbey of Leicester, where he received the two last charities of a death-bed and grave, with many circumstances thus affectingly narrated by Cavendish: “Upon Monday in the morning, as I stood by his bed-side, about eight of the clock, the windows being close shut, having wax lights burning upon the cupboard, I beheld him, as me seemed, drawing fast to his end. He perceiving my shadow upon the wall by his bed-side, asked who was there? ‘Sir, I am here,’ quoth I.—‘How do you?’ quoth he to me.—‘Very well, sir,’ quoth I, ‘if I might see your grace well.’—‘What is it of the clock?’ said he to me.—‘Forsooth, sir,’ said I, ‘it is past eight of the clock in the morning.’—‘Eight of the clock?’ quoth he, ‘that cannot be;’ rehearsing divers times, ‘eight of the clock, eight of the clock; nay, nay;’ quoth he at the last, ‘it cannot be eight of the clock: for by eight of the clock ye shall lose your master: for my time draweth near that I must depart out of this world.’ With that master Doctor Palmes, a worshipful gentleman, being his chaplain and ghostly father, standing by, bade me secretly demand of him if he would be shriven, and to be in a readiness towards God, whatsoever should chance. At whose desire I asked him that question. ‘What have you to do to ask me any such question?’ quoth he, and began to be very angry with me for my presumption; until at the last master doctor took my part, and talked with him in Latin, and so pacified him.”

Kingston entered, and bade him good morning. “I tarry, master Kingston, but the will and pleasure of God, to render unto him my simple soul into his divine hand.” After a pause, and after having explained the fatal nature of his disease, dysentery, he addressed himself again to Kingston as follows:—

“ ‘Master Kingston, my disease is such that I cannot live; I have had some experience in my disease, and thus it is: I have a flux with a continual fever; the nature whereof is this, that if there be no alteration with me of the same within eight days, then must either ensue excoriation of the entrails, or frenzy, or else present death; and the best thereof is death. And as I suppose, this is the eighth day: and if ye see in me no alteration, then is there no remedy (although I may live a day or twaine) but death, which is the best remedy of the three.’— ‘Nay, sir, in good faith,’ quoth Master Kingston, ‘you be in such dolor and pensiveness, doubting that thing that indeed ye need not to fear, which maketh you much worse than ye should be.’— ‘Well, well, Master Kingston,’ quoth he, ‘I see the matter against me how it is framed; *but if I had served God as diligently as I have done the king, he would not have given me over in my grey hairs.* Howbeit, this is the just reward that I must receive for my worldly diligence and pains that I have had to do him service; only to satisfy his vain pleasure, not regarding my godly duty.” The dying man, having laid his injunctions upon Kingston most humbly to commend him unto his royal majesty, proceeded thus:—

“ ‘And say furthermore, that I request his Grace, in God’s name, that he have a vigilant eye to depress this new pernicious sect of Lutherans, that it do not increase within his dominions through his negligence, in such a sort, as that he shall be fain at length to put harness upon his back to subdue them; as the king of Bohemia who had good game, to see his rude commons (then infected with Wickliffe’s heresies) to spoil and murder the spiritual men and religious persons of his realm; the which fled to the king and his nobles for succour against their frantic rage; of whom they could get no help of defence or refuge, but (they) laughed them to scorn, having good game at their spoil and consumption, not regarding their duties nor their own defence.—

“ ‘Master Kingston, farewell. I can no more, but wish all things to have good success. My time draweth on fast. I may not tarry with you. And forget not, I pray you, what I have said and charged you withal; for when I am dead, ye shall peradventure remember my words much better.’ And even with these words he began to draw his speech at length, and his tongue to fail; his eyes being set in his head, whose sight failed him. Then we began to put him in remembrance of Christ’s passion; and sent for the abbot of the place to anneal him, who came with all speed, and ministered unto him all the service to the same belonging; and caused also the guard to stand by, both to hear him talk before his death, and also to witness of the same; and incontinent the clock struck eight, at which time he gave up the ghost, and thus departed he this present life.” He expired, as he had predicted, as the clock struck eight, on the 28th of November, 1530, in the 60th year of his age.

The moral pathos of this closing scene of Wolsey’s life must soften our feelings towards him. But historical justice requires us to pronounce the most unqualified sentence of condemnation upon his whole political career as one of boundless and unprincipled ambition throughout.

Anne Boleyn.

BORN A. D. 1507.—DIED A. D. 1536.

THIS unfortunate princess was born in 1507. Her father was Sir Thomas Boleyn, afterwards created earl of Wiltshire and Ormonde, and her mother was daughter of the duke of Norfolk. At the age of seven or eight, she accompanied Mary, Henry's sister, to France, at the time when that princess became the wife of Louis XII. After Mary's return to England, Anne remained in France, as an attendant on Claude, the queen of Francis I. and she is said to have lived thereafter with the duchess of Alençon. The precise date of her final return to England is uncertain. Burnet supposes that she came back with her father in 1527. In England she became a maid of honour to queen Catharine, in which situation she seems to have been free from gross outward impropriety of conduct. "She carried herself so," says Burnet, speaking of this period of her life, "that, in the whole progress of the suit"—this refers to the action of divorce from Catharine—"I never find the queen herself or any of her agents fix the least ill character on her, which would most certainly have been done had there been any just cause or good colour for it."¹ During her residence at court, she attracted the attention of Lord Percy, son of the earl of Northumberland, and a page in the household of Cardinal Wolsey. Accordingly, a marriage between Anne and Lord Percy was proposed, but the cardinal and the king himself objected to the match. Considering the future history of Henry, it is natural to infer from his objecting to the marriage of the noble youth, that his own attachment to the young and beautiful maid of honour had begun; and from a confession of the king himself, an excellent historian has traced that attachment to the year 1527.² Accordingly we find that in May of that year she was his partner in the dance, at a royal entertainment given at Greenwich. It was in the July immediately succeeding, that Knight was sent to Rome, with a view to a divorce from Catharine. While the tedious process for obtaining that object was proceeding, Anne was considered as a favourite, if not as a mistress, of the king; and few, perhaps, if any, will doubt, that his attachment to the maiden, whose external charms may be allowed—without derogating from the virtuous character of Catharine—to have been greatly superior to the queen's, fostered, or at least accompanied his scruples respecting the validity of his marriage, supposing these to be sincere. As to the particular manner, however, in which his passion influenced his mind in his attempt to have the marriage nullified, there may be room for question. Sir James Mackintosh seems

¹ History of the Reformation, Book ii. The same author has largely refuted, in regard to Anne Boleyn, an old historian, Sanders, by whom she is represented as the daughter of Henry VIII. himself by the lady of Sir Thomas Boleyn, and as very dissolute in the early period of her life. Sanders seems to have aimed at blackening the character of Anne, under the influence of party-feeling.

² Sir J. Mackintosh, History of England, vol. ii. p. 191. "He reproaches her," says the historian, speaking of Henry and Anne, "for cruelty to one 'who was one whole year struck with the dart of love,' which fixes the commencement of his passion in 1527."

to think,³ that the only conceivable reason for Henry's perseverance in that long and tedious process, is, the refusal of Anne Boleyn to gratify his desire on any other terms than those of an authorized marriage. To us, however, it appears, that, independently of such resistance on the part of Anne, the scholastic scruples and headstrong spirit of the king might go far to explain his perseverance in his suit for a divorce. But that she *did* hold out against the unlawful gratification of his desires, seems generally admitted, even among those who may doubt whether she did not yield previously to her private marriage with the king in 1533—a question which, like many others, it is now, perhaps, impossible to settle. One of her biographers represents it as questionable whether she would not have been less guilty in becoming Henry's concubine, than in causing the degradation of the virtuous Catharine.⁴ But whether she was influenced in the desire which she seems to have felt for the king's divorce, by her judgment on the moral questions it involved, or whether she was not prompted merely by the prospects of ambition and the blandishments of love, are points perhaps no longer ascertainable. That she heartily entered, however, into Henry's scheme, or at least felt a personal interest in the result, it may be safely inferred from a letter addressed by her and the king conjointly to Cardinal Wolsey.

At length, after a protracted suit for a divorce, and before he had obtained it, the king was privately married to Anne Boleyn, who had previously been created marchioness of Pembroke. The marriage took place, by one account, on the 14th of November, 1532, by another, about the 25th of January, 1533. Dr Lee is said to have performed the ceremony, in presence of Lord and Lady Wiltshire and other friends. In May thereafter, Archbishop Cranmer pronounced the king's marriage with Catharine invalid, and on the 1st of June, Anne was crowned. "Which mass and ceremonies done," says Cranmer, speaking of this occasion, "all the assembly of noblemen brought her into Westminster-hall again, where was kept a great solemn feast all that day; the good order thereof were too long to write at this time to you. But now, Sir, you must not imagine that this coronation was before her marriage; for she was married much about St Paul's day last, as the condition thereof doth well appear by reason she is now somewhat big with child. Notwithstanding, it hath been reported throughout a great part of the realm that I married her, which was plainly false, for myself knew not thereof a fortnight after it was done. And many other things be also reported of me, which be mere lies and tales."⁵

On the 7th of September, Anne was delivered of a daughter—afterwards the illustrious queen Elizabeth. But from the height of her greatness, a few intermediate notices of her life will bring us to the circumstances of its melancholy close. That she joined her husband in his support of religious reformation there cannot be a doubt; nor, on the other hand, can we deny, that, in the earlier part of her residence at court she conformed to the Romish church. It has been represented

³ Life of Sir Thomas More, in Lives of British Statesmen (Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia), vol. i. p. 77.

⁴ Female Biography, by Mary Hays, vol. ii. p. 10.

⁵ Original Letters, illustrative of English History, edited by Mr Ellis, 1st Series.

as no very uncharitable way of accounting for her renunciation of the authority of Rome, to consider it as resulting from a belief that it would clear for her a passage to the throne. It might seem almost unnatural to suppose, that this consideration, and a prudent or somewhat careless subservience to the will of Henry, had no influence in determining her profession and her creed; but, it is also to be considered, that the question of ecclesiastical authority became, about the time of her marriage, a subject of learned and general debate, so that a mind even moderately free from Romish bigotry, might be led to a change of opinion on the subject.⁶ It is remarked, too, by Bishop Burnet, that she received impressions in favour of Protestantism during her residence with the duchess of Alençon.⁷ She chose Staunton and Latimer as chaplains; and to her influence has been attributed the choice of Henry to have the Bible translated into English, and also an attempt which was made to accommodate the differences with foreign Protestants. She also seems to have been of a kind disposition. It is said that, in the course of nine months, she bestowed upwards of £14,000 in charity; and, in a statute granting pardon to persons not included in the act of attainder, for concealment and misprision in the matter of the maid of Kent, the king is represented as bestowing it "at the humble suit of his well-beloved wife, Queen Anne."

Two eminent official characters—Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More—fell victims to their refusal to take the oath relative to the new succession to the crown. The latter had set himself decidedly against the marriage of the king with Anne, and had cautioned the bishops against attending at her coronation. But, when in prison, and shortly before his execution, which occurred early in July, 1535, his amiable heart seemed to think of her with pity. He asked of his daughter, Margaret Roper, how the new queen was. "Never better," she replied. "Never better, Meg!" said More, "Alas! it pitieth me to remember into what misery, poor soul, she shall shortly come." The prediction was fulfilled—and in a manner of which she seems to have little thought, when she gave signs of satisfaction on occasion of Catharine's death, in January, 1536. That year, Anne was delivered of a still-born son. To this circumstance a change in Henry's affection has been ascribed—a change which was encouraged by her enemies of the Romish church. On the 24th of April, there was issued a commission to certain noblemen and judges, to inquire into allegations which had been raised against her: and, according to a popular story, at a tilting held at Greenwich on the 1st of May, a handkerchief dropped by the queen, and picked up and returned to her by Henry

⁶ See a summary of arguments on both sides of the question between the king and the pope in reference to ecclesiastical supremacy, and a representation of the successive steps by which the power of the latter came to be called in question, in Burnet's 'History of the Reformation.' It is not impossible that Henry himself was in some degree influenced by the arguments adduced in support of the civil magistrate, on the subject of ecclesiastical authority—an idea not inconsistent with the belief that there is truth in the pointed, but somewhat indecorous line of Gray:—

"And Gospel light first beamed from Bullen's eyes."

⁷ "Anne Boleyn," says he, 'Hist. of Reform.' "had, in the duchess of Alençon's court, (who inclined to the reformation), received such impressions as made them"—members of one of the English universities—"fear that her greatness and Cranmer's preferment, would encourage heresy, to which the universities were furiously averse."

Norris, stirred the mind of Henry, who forthwith left the hall, and ordered Anne to be confined to her own apartments. At first she was cheerful, observing, that she thought the king merely meant to try her, but at length, considering the matter as serious, she begged that she might partake of the sacrament. On the 2d of May, her relative, the duke of Norfolk, conveyed her to the tower. On landing, she declared her innocence of what was alleged against her; and, on hearing that she was to take up her residence in that part of the tower where she lay at the time of her coronation, she exclaimed, "It is too good for me! Jesus have mercy upon me!" In her imprisonment, she was attended by her uncle's wife, lady Boleyn, with whom she had lived on by no means friendly terms. Words that she uttered in what seemed a state of hysterical excitement were reported, and she was cross-examined as to what she had said. Hearing that Norris, and a musician of the name of Smeaton, had accused her of guilt, she exclaimed, "O Norris! hast thou accused me? Thou art in the tower with me, and we shall die together,—and thou too, Mark!" She acknowledged that certain free expressions had passed between herself and Norris, Smeaton, and an individual of the name of Weston. Confessions which a milder judge might have deemed a candid or an extorted acknowledgment of such levity as was natural to a rash and lively woman, though no unfaithful and undutiful wife, were not unlikely to be viewed, by Henry and the enemies of Anne, with a harsh and suspicious eye. She declared, however, to the lieutenant of the tower, that she was "clear from the company of men," and "the king's true wife."

From the tower, the queen was conveyed back to Greenwich, where she was examined before the privy council. On her return, she complained that she had "been cruelly handled by the council." On the 10th of May, an indictment for high treason was found against her, Lord Rochford, Norris, Smeaton, Weston, and a gentleman of the privy-chamber, of the name of Brereton. On the 12th, the four last mentioned of these persons were tried, and condemned. All of them, except Smeaton, denied to the last. He acknowledged unlawful intercourse with the queen; but of the circumstances in which the confession was made, we are in a great measure ignorant; a circumstance suggested by a historian, to which, for the sake of historical justice, it is important to advert. On the 15th, the queen, and Lord Rochford, her brother, who, it appears, had been seen leaning on her bed, were tried within the tower, whether for the concealment of injustice, or from motives of delicacy, or for some other reason, we shall not decide. After the trial of her brother, Anne came forward to the bar without the attendance of any legal advisers. She appeared as her own advocate, and it was remarked that she delivered "a most noble speech." We know not that there is any account, at once copious and authentic, of the trial. It appears, however, that Smeaton, who had been previously convicted, was not confronted with the queen on this occasion; and "for the evidence," says an old writer, "as I never could hear of any, small I believe it is." Sentence of death was pronounced against her, and, on the 17th, she was conveyed to Lambeth, where Cranmer pronounced her marriage with Henry null, setting forth, that she had confessed "certain, just, and lawful impediments," which rendered it "utterly void" from the very first. What these alleged "impediments"

were, seems a point by no means certain. The objection has been supposed to be a contract between Anne and Lord Percy, now earl of Northumberland, entered into before her marriage with the king. Percy had spoken to Wolsey as if he had given her a pledge from which it would have been unsafe or dishonourable in him to withdraw; but in a letter, dated a few days before the trial of the queen, he says that he had solemnly disclaimed having entered into such a contract. But whatever the impediments may have been, it is not without reason that Burnet represents the sentence at the trial and the decision of the prelate, as somewhat inconsistent with each other. "Her marriage to the king," says he,¹¹ "was either a true marriage or not. If it was true, then the annulling of it was unjust; and if it was no true marriage, then the attainder was unjust; for there could be no breach of that faith which was never given."

After her condemnation, the queen possessed an air of cheerfulness and even gaiety. Her tranquillity and satisfaction in prospect of death have, not without reason, been suggested as an evidence of innocence. "I hear I shall not die before noon," said she, on the day of her death, to the lieutenant of the tower; "I am sorry for it, for I thought to be dead by this time, and past my pain." He told her there should be no pain. "I heard say," said she, "that the executioner brought over was more expert than any in England. That is very good, for I have a little neck," putting her hands around it, and laughing heartily. On the last day of her life, she again affirmed her innocence, and, after stating that, in prospect of her approaching death, the queen, remembering her severity towards the Lady Mary, besought the wife of the lieutenant of the tower, to go, in her name, to the princess, and ask forgiveness for the wrong. Bishop Burnet remarks on the circumstance, as appearing to indicate, that, if Anne had been guilty of greater faults, she would not have denied them to the last. Strong, however, as are the presumptions in her favour, and imperfect as appears to be the evidence against her, we shall not deny that her guilt or innocence is an undetermined, perhaps an undeterminable question; a secret, which, like so many other points in history, awaits for its decision—the judgment-seat of God.

The scaffold was erected within the tower. When brought forth to execution on the 19th of May, 1536, the queen addressed the audience in the following terms:—"Good Christian people, I am come hither to die according to law. By the law I am judged to die, and therefore I shall say nothing against it. I am come hither to accuse no man, nor to speak any thing of that whereof I am accused. I pray, God save the king, and send him long to reign over you; for a gentler or more merciful prince was there never. To me he was ever a good, gentle, and sovereign lord. If any person will meddle with my cause, I require them to judge the best. Thus I take my leave of the world and of you, and I heartily desire you all to pray for me." She commended her soul to Jesus Christ, and, after some difficulty occasioned by her reluctance to have a bandage round her eyes, received the fatal blow.

When the prosecution of Anne Boleyn commenced, Henry had conceived an affection for the beautiful Jane Seymour. This attachment

¹¹ History of the Reformation, Book iii.

has naturally been supposed to have influenced his behaviour towards Anne. On the very day after the execution of the queen, he married Jane, who "was happy," says Bishop Burnet, "in one thing, that she did not outlive his love."

Sir Thomas More.

BORN A. D. 1480.—DIED A. D. 1535.

THIS great man, so justly admired for his virtues, and especially for his political integrity when exposed to peculiar trials, was the son of Sir John More, knight, one of the judges of the King's Bench. He was born in the year 1480, in Milk street, London, and educated at a school in the immediate neighbourhood, under the eye of his father, who paid much attention to his improvement. The genius and docility of the son amply repaid the solicitude of the parent, who had the satisfaction of seeing him, at the early age of sixteen, distinguished at college for his classical and scientific attainments.

Having remained two years at Christ church, Oxford, he applied himself to the study of the law at New inn, London, and subsequently at Lincoln's inn, of which his father was a member. On being called to the bar he soon distinguished himself, and was beginning to acquire reputation, when his mind took a sudden turn in favour of a monastic life, and for some time he secluded himself from the world. In the retirement of the charter-house he spent his days and nights in devotion and austerities, such as wearing a hair-shirt next the skin, frequent fasting, and sleeping on a bare plank,—at the same time prosecuting scholastic studies.

From this course, however, he was induced to swerve at the earnest solicitation of his father; and he once more resumed his station at the bar. On coming of age he was returned a member of parliament. Here he opposed the motion for granting a large subsidy for the marriage of Margaret, the eldest daughter of Henry VII., with James of Scotland; and with so much vigour that the motion was rejected. The king, on being informed that "a beardless boy had frustrated all his schemes," gratified both his resentment and his cupidity by committing More's father to the tower on some frivolous charge; from whence he was released by paying a fine of £100.

The rising celebrity of young More procured him the office of law-reader at Furnival's Inn; and, by a singular coalition of sacred and civil duties, he at the same time read public lectures in the church of St Lawrence, Old Jewry, on Augustine's great work, *De Civitate Dei*. This latter occupation seems to have suited his taste rather than the former: indeed, he carried his ideas on religion so far as to have intended to become a Franciscan friar. This spell, however, was broken by the more powerful charm of a matrimonial alliance. Being on a visit to John Colt, Esq. of Newhall in Essex, he was smitten with the attractions of the second of his three daughters; but, by a singular regard to propriety, sacrificed his inclinations, and made his suit to the eldest daughter, lest she should feel hurt by the preference for her sister. For seven years, until her death, this lady rewarded her husband's self-

denial by a grateful and tender affection, which was returned by him with equal tenderness ; his social, lively turn endeared him to home, and his house was the abode of comfort and peace :—so different was his present situation from the monk's cell to which he had before been devoted.

He was now engaged at the head of his profession as a lawyer ; and, from his known hatred of a bad cause, took the lead in every thing at the bar.¹ His eminence as a lawyer procured him in 1508, even during the life of Henry VII., the appointment of judge of the sheriff's court in the city of London, with other honourable distinctions. Thus advancing in fame and esteem he became particularly noticed by the man who sat at the helm of affairs, Cardinal Wolsey, and in 1514 he entered upon a diplomatic mission with Bishop Tonstal and Dr Knight, who were despatched by Henry to Flanders for the purpose of renewing the alliance with the archduke of Austria, afterwards Charles V. On his return he was offered a pension by the king, which he declined, but accepted the place of master of the requests. Soon after he was created a knight, and admitted a member of the privy council. About the same time, having become a widower, he married again ; and, according to Erasmus, the lady would not have appeared to possess any attractions except in the eyes of her devoted husband. Being now much at court he became a special favourite with the king, who was charmed with his vivacity, and consulted him freely on matters of state, placing great reliance on his judgment and temper.² Sir Thomas, however, had the discernment to perceive the precarious tenure of courtly favour ; and, from his affectionate regard to his family, and the superior enjoyment of domestic life, he gradually declined from his frequent attendance at court, assuming purposely a more grave deportment in opposition to that natural facetiousness which made him the life of the royal circle.

The king, notwithstanding, continued to bestow on his faithful servant the most substantial proofs of his regard ; and, on the death of the treasurer of the exchequer, in 1520, he was appointed his successor. In 1523, through the influence of the court, he was chosen speaker of the house of commons. Here he opposed Wolsey, and was again the means of preventing the levy of an oppressive subsidy. Wolsey had appeared in the house with a royal message requiring the sum of £800,000, and proposing to raise it by a property tax of twenty per cent. The cardinal having in vain attempted to break the obstinate silence of the house, addressed himself to the speaker, who respectfully intimated to him that no debate could proceed in his presence. The cardinal afterward sent for the speaker : "Would to God !" said he, "Master More, you had been at Rome, when I made you speaker !" "Your grace not offended," he replied, "so would I too, my lord." Such was his integrity, however, that his independent conduct contributed to his promotion, and in addition to his other posts, the chancellorship of the duchy of Lancaster was bestowed upon him, and he was made treasurer of the household. Henry, in short, seemed determined to engage Sir Thomas effectually to himself, and cultivated the most familiar acquaintance with him—frequently visiting him at Chelsea,

¹ Roper.

² Erasmus.

where he had recently erected a house on the banks of the Thames. But if Henry had discernment enough to value the character of the favourite, the latter was not unmindful of the adage, that 'favour is deceitful.' In illustration of this remark, it is related, that the king, having been walking in the gardens at Chelsea for an hour, with his arm thrown familiarly over Sir Thomas's shoulder, one of his sons-in-law afterwards observed to him that he must feel particularly gratified on being upon such intimate terms with the king: to which he replied;—"I thank the Lord, I find his Grace to be a very good master indeed, and believe he is as partial to me, as to any subject within his realm: but yet I have no cause to presume on his favour, for if my head could win him but a castle in France, it would not long remain on my shoulders."³

In the years 1526 and 1529, Sir Thomas was employed with Wolsey, Tonsal, and others, in embassies on the continent. He was engaged also in correspondence with Erasmus and other learned men, and undertook to defend the king by a violent attack on Luther, who had published several animadversions on the royal 'Defender of the Faith.'

During the disgraceful proceedings against Queen Catharine, and while the affair of the divorce divided the country, Sir Thomas inclined to the side of the queen. His opinion and conduct would have great weight, and it was by all means desirable, if possible, to obtain his sanction to a measure which the king was resolved to carry. In this view, as well as on account of his extraordinary merits, when by the fall of Wolsey, the great seal was vacant, that high office was conferred on Sir Thomas More. The chancellorship had usually been held only by dignified churchmen,⁴ but under the extraordinary circumstances of the court, there were reasons why the post should neither be given to them nor accepted by them. The innovation here commenced. As a scholar, More was universally celebrated; as a lawyer, he had practised long with great reputation, he had much experience in the business of life, and had executed with satisfaction important diplomatic duties: even the cardinal, whom he had thwarted, acknowledged that he knew no one more worthy to be his successor. On the 26th of October, 1529, he was, therefore, installed with public honours. A crowd of bishops and noblemen accompanied him to the starchamber: and the duke of Norfolk conducted him to his seat, pronounced an eulogium on his talents and virtues, and observed that, if, in this instance, the king had departed from ancient precedent, he was fully justified by the superior merit of the new chancellor. More in return professed his obligation to the king and to the duke; and at the same time paid an eloquent compliment to the abilities of his predecessor, whose example would stimulate him to the faithful discharge of his duty, and whose fall would teach him to moderate his ambition.⁵ The chancellor, by his whole conduct during the short period in which he retained this dignity, fully justified the high expectations formed respecting his character; and, after presiding in the court of chancery two years, such had been his diligence, that one day on calling for the next cause, it was answered that there was not one then depending.

³ Roper.

⁴ "Thorpe, in 1371, and Knivett, in 1372, seem to be the last exceptions."—*Life of More in Cabinet Library.*

⁵ More's *Life of Sir Thomas More*.

Parties now ran high. The divorce of Catharine involved several religious questions of great importance, and was intimately connected with the ultimate renunciation of the papal authority in England. The chancellor, by the king's desire, had discussed with the Doctors Lee, Cranmer, Fox, and Nicholas, the lawfulness of the divorce; but the apparent weakness of their reasoning served only to convince him of the soundness of his own opinion; and, at his earnest request, he was indulged with the permission to retire from the council-chamber as often as that subject was brought under consideration. In the discharge of his office, however, he found himself unavoidably engaged in matters which he could not reconcile with his conscience: and, at length he tendered his resignation on the ground that age and infirmity admonished him to give his whole attention to the concerns of his soul. Henry, who had flattered himself that the repugnance of More would gradually give way, was aware how much his retirement would prejudice the royal cause in the mind of the public. But he deemed it prudent to suppress his feelings; dismissed his faithful servant with profession of esteem and promises of future favour; gave the seals to Sir Thomas Audeley, a lawyer of less scrupulous conscience, and ordered the new chancellor, at his installation, to pronounce a eulogy on the merits of his predecessor, expressing at the same time, the reluctance with which the king had accepted his resignation.⁶

On the day after the resignation, he attended with his family at church, and heard mass. On the conclusion of the service, instead of proceeding in state, he turned round to his wife, and, with a low bow, said, "Madam, my lord is gone." This was the first intimation to his family that he had resigned, and produced, from the lips of his disappointed lady, a torrent of reproach, which he was prepared to endure with his accustomed equanimity.

Having thus made his escape from court to the beloved retirement of his family, his whole care was to provide for their comfort, and to prepare for that fate which, amidst all the royal professions of regard, he foreboded. As a proof of his moderation and integrity, after filling some of the highest offices of state, and being engaged in a lucrative profession for nearly twenty years, his annual income, on his retirement, did not exceed £100; and, after his debts were paid, not more than that amount remained to him in money.

The time was now approaching when the friend and favourite of royalty was to realise the truth of his own predictions. Much as Henry might have been attached to his chancellor, his inflexibility on the subject of the divorce, and his refusal to assent to the new doctrine of the royal supremacy in the church, were quite sufficient to alienate the king for ever from him, and to convert his favour into the most malignant and cruel hatred. The king, with the divorce party, therefore, commenced their persecution by inserting his name in a bill of attainder for misprision of treason. This charge was grounded on some slight communications which he had held with Elizabeth Barton, the maid of Kent, who had mingled political matters with her pretended revelations. From this charge, however, Sir Thomas defended himself with such evidences that the indictment was withdrawn. This scheme

⁶ Mori epist. ad Erasmum.

having failed, in about a fortnight afterward he was summoned, with Fisher, bishop of Rochester, to the council at Lambeth, and required to take the new oath of succession. More, who was introduced first, offered to swear to the succession alone, but not to every particular contained in the act, alleging that "the act of parliament was like a sword with two edges; for if a man answer one way, it will destroy the soul, and if he answer another, it will destroy the body." The answer of the bishop being substantially the same, they were both committed to the tower. Being attainted again of misprision of treason, for refusing the oath, he became subject to the loss of all his property and to perpetual imprisonment. After a rigorous confinement of fifteen months in the tower, during which time he was supported by the charity of his friends, conveyed by the hands of his favourite daughter, Margaret Roper, he was at length placed a prisoner at the bar of that very court, in which he had presided as judge with universal applause. To make the greater impression, he was conducted on foot, through the most frequented streets, from the tower to Westminster-hall. He appeared in a coarse woollen gown; his hair, which had lately become grey, his face, which, though cheerful, was pale and emaciated, and the staff with which he supported his feeble steps, announced the length and severity of his confinement, and a general feeling of horror and sympathy ran through the spectators.

The indictment had been framed of enormous length and unexampled exaggeration. As soon as it had been read, the chancellor, who was assisted by the duke of Norfolk, Fitzjames, the chief justice, and six other commissioners, informed the prisoner that it was still in his power to close the proceedings and to recover the royal favour, by abjuring his former opinion. With expressions of gratitude he declined the favour, and commenced a long and eloquent defence. Though, he observed, it was not in his power to recollect one third part of the indictment, he would venture to comprise its contents under four heads. 1. In the first place, it was objected to him as an offence, that he had disapproved of the king's marriage with Anne Boleyn. He acknowledged the charge; but then his disapprobation had never been communicated to any other person than the king himself: and not even to the king, till Henry had commanded him, on his allegiance, to disclose his real sentiments. In such circumstances, to dissemble would have been a crime,—to speak with sincerity was a duty. 2. He was next charged with having traitorously sought to deprive the king of his title of head of the church. But where was the proof? That, on his examination in the tower, he had said, that he was by his attainder become civilly dead: that he was out of the protection of the law, and, therefore, could not be required to give an opinion of the merits of the law: and that his only occupation was, and would be, to meditate on the passion of Christ, and to prepare himself for his own death. But, what was there of crime in such an answer? It contained no word, it proved no deed against the statute. All that could be objected against him was silence; and silence had not yet been declared treason. 3. It was maintained that, in different letters written by him in the tower, he had exhorted Bishop Fisher to oppose the supremacy. He denied it. Let the letters be produced; by their contents he was willing to stand or fall. 4. But Fisher, on his examination, had held

the same language as More, a proof of a conspiracy between them. What Fisher had said he knew not : but it could not excite surprise, if the similarity of their case had suggested to each similar ideas. This he could affirm with truth, that whatever might be his own opinion, he had never communicated it to any, not even to his dearest friends.

This defence, how reasonable soever it may appear, availed nothing. New charges were brought forward. Rich, the solicitor-general, deposed that, in a private conversation in the tower, More had said : "The parliament cannot make the king head of the church, because it is a civil tribunal, without any spiritual authority." It was in vain that the prisoner denied this statement, showing that such a declaration was inconsistent with the caution which he had always observed ; and maintained that no one acquainted with the former character of Rich would believe him, even on his oath. It was in vain that the two witnesses, who were brought to support the charge, eluded the expectation of the accuser, by declaring, that, though they were in the room, they did not attend to the conversation : the judges maintained that the silence of the prisoner was a sufficient proof of malicious intention ; and the jury, without reading over the copy of the indictment which had been given them, returned a verdict of guilty.

As soon as the sentence had been pronounced, More attempted, and, after two interruptions, was suffered to address the court. He would now, he said, openly avow, what he had hitherto concealed from every human being, his conviction that the oath of supremacy was unlawful. it was indeed, painful to him to differ from the noble lords whom he saw on the bench ; but his conscience compelled him to bear testimony to the truth. This world, however, had always been a scene of dissension and he still cherished a hope that the day would come, when both he and they, like Stephen and Saul, would be of the same sentiment in heaven. As he returned from the bar, his son threw himself on his knees, and begged his father's blessing ; and, as he walked back to the tower, his daughter Margaret twice rushed through the guards, folded him in her arms, and, unable to speak, bathed him with her tears. When told that the king, as a special favour, had commuted his punishment to decapitation, "God," he replied, "preserve all my friends from such favours!"

After the lapse of five days from his trial, he was brought forth for execution, on Tower-hill, on the 6th of July, 1535. His firmness did not for a moment desert him, nor even his usual flow of humour. When ascending the stairs of the scaffold, and observing they were weak, he desired one of the sheriff's officers to give him his hand to help him up, saying, "When I come down again, let me shift for myself as well as I can." On the scaffold, the executioner asked his forgiveness. He kissed him, saying, "Thou wilt render me to-day the greatest service in the power of any mortal ; but," (putting an angel into his hand,) "my neck is so short that I fear thou wilt gain little credit in the way of thy profession." As he was not permitted to address the spectators, he contented himself with declaring that he died a faithful subject to the king, and a sure Catholic before God. When he had laid his head on the block to receive the mortal stroke, he perceived that

his beard had got under his chin, whereupon hastily rising up, he bade the executioner stay a little till he had put his beard aside, since, having committed no treason, it was not just it should be cut off. At one blow his head was severed from his body. This was at first interred in the tower, but his daughter Margaret afterward obtained it and deposited it in the chancel of the church at Chelsea, where a monument, with an inscription written by himself, had been some time previously erected. His head, after an exposure of fourteen days on London bridge, was also procured by Margaret Roper, and placed by her in a vault belonging to her husband's family, under a chapel adjoining to St Dunstan's church, in Canterbury.

Thus fell Sir Thomas More, in the fifty-fifth year of his age, a martyr to the papal supremacy in England, and to a conscientious adherence to the Roman Catholic religion, in all its substantial character. Reformation of gross abuses and corruptions he would have admitted; but innovation he firmly opposed. Doubtless he was sincere, and must therefore be respected for his consistency. He had, indeed, abetted the numerous and cruel persecutions of the reformed, and had endeavoured most strenuously to suppress the writings of Luther in England, and the new translation of the Scriptures, by Tindal, into English. This he no doubt did on principle, thinking that he "was thereby doing God service:" and however we may lament his error, we should impute it chiefly to the darkness of the age in which he lived. With this concession, still it must be admitted that such men as More should have been divested of prejudice sufficient to allow the darkness to be dissipated by the day-spring of divine truth, nor have attempted to perpetuate the gloom of monkish ignorance and superstition overspreading a nation. The glorious light of truth and liberty was then dawning upon our land, by the diffusion of the holy scriptures, and it was in vain that every effort was made by authority to extinguish the heavenly beams. Tonstal, bishop of London, employed one Packington, an English merchant, to buy up one half of Tindal's first edition of his New Testament, for the purpose of burning the copies in Cheap-side. This enabled Tindal to print a second and improved edition, which was imported from Antwerp. Lord-chancellor More, inquiring who it was that supported and encouraged Tindal, was told that it was the bishop of London, who had bought up half the old impression. This raised the laugh against More and the bishop. But they should have seen the impolicy of continuing their system of persecution against such a cause. And it seems the more strange that Sir Thomas More should have promoted such bloody persecutions, which must have been abhorrent to his nature, when he says, in his *Utopia*, written in younger years, that "the Utopians allow liberty of conscience, and force their religion upon nobody: that they hinder none from a sober inquiry into truth, nor use any violence upon the account of a different belief." These very Utopians, in the persons of the reformed, he and his colleagues burned at the stake. Three centuries, however, have converted the fabulous laws of *Utopia* into the established principles of Christendom; and Sir Thomas More would now be as strenuous an advocate for liberty of conscience as he was formerly a conscientious persecutor of conscientious sufferers.

Sir Thomas More was a man of literary habits and character, as well

as a man of business. Besides maintaining constant correspondence with the learned in Europe, he wrote many works, principally of a polemical character: his *Utopia*, however, is the only work which distinguishes him as a writer. His English works were collected and published by order of Queen Mary, in 1557; his Latin, at Basil, in 1563, and at Louvain, in 1566. On the whole, for integrity, disinterestedness, domestic affection, and diligence and fidelity in great public duties, Sir Thomas More stands a pattern and an ornament to the English nation.

Cromwell, Earl of Essex.

DIED A. D. 1540.

THE father of this distinguished minister of Henry VIII. followed the humble business of a blacksmith, at Putney, in the county of Surrey. At his native place, young Cromwell received an imperfect education, and thereafter, prompted, perhaps, by an ardour of disposition destined to open up his way to the lofty station which he subsequently filled, he left his country for the continent. At Antwerp, he found employment in the English factory. He afterwards served under the duke of Bourbon, and is said to have been present at the sack of Rome, in 1528. This connection may have had some influence in leading him to those Protestant sentiments which he afterwards professed.¹

On returning to England, Cromwell became a confidential servant to Cardinal Wolsey, with whose falling glories his name has been so indissolubly combined by Shakspeare, not without historical reason, though perhaps not without the licence of a poet in regard to the details.² The actual part which Cromwell took on occasion of his master's fall corresponded with the tribute to his fidelity which the dramatist puts into the mouth of Wolsey. It is recorded, to the honour of the former, that when the fallen minister was unable to pay his servants during his residence at Esher, Cromwell proposed that a subscription should be made among those who had shared in the cardinal's bounty—which subscription was carried into effect, and headed by Cromwell himself. On another occasion, when the charge against the cardinal,

¹ "Of this sect," says Sir Thomas More, speaking of the Lutherans, "was the great part of those ungracious people, which of late entered Rome with the duke of Bourbon."—*Dialogue touching the pestilent sect of Luther*. In regard to the number here stated by Sir Thomas, however, Sir James Mackintosh, in his life of Sir Thomas More, (*Lives of British Statesmen*,) remarks, that it is "a violent exaggeration."

² *King Henry VIII., Act II., Sc. 2.* It is by a conception at once moral and pathetic, that the cardinal, bereft of his honours by the powerful hand that conferred them, is in this scene represented as inculcating on a faithful servant, likely to rise at court, a more virtuous course than that which he himself had pursued. From history, however, it appears to have been to Kingston, the constable of the tower, soon before the cardinal's death, that he uttered those celebrated expressions, addressed, in the play, to Cromwell:—

"Had I but served my God with half the zeal
I served my king, he would not in mine age
Have left me naked to mine enemies."

It may be added, that the compliment which, in the course of this scene, Wolsey pays to the king,—"*I know his noble nature*,"—and also the allusions to the likelihood that Cromwell would rise at court, correspond to other parts of the same interview with Sir W. Kingston, as may be seen from Hume's *History of England*, ch. xxx.

agreed to by the house of lords in November, 1529, came down to the house of commons, Cromwell defended his master's cause in a style which has not only gained him honour, but has been considered as having occasioned the triumph of Wolsey over the articles in question, and laid a foundation for Cromwell's own advancement at the court of Henry.

On Wolsey's death, Cromwell devoted himself to the service of the king, to whom he is said to have been recommended by Sir Cristopher Hales and Sir John Russel, the latter of whom had been indebted to him for an escape from danger on the continent. Shortly after giving a bold specimen of his political skill, and of his disposition, it may be, to gratify his master, by drawing from the clergy, with royal authority, the sum of £118,840, on the allegation, that the oath of allegiance to the pope, taken by the bishops at their consecration, was illegal, he received the honour of knighthood, and was admitted to the privy council. To use the words of Shakspeare,

“ There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.”

Cromwell, it seems, had “ taken the current when it served,” and we have now to follow him in a triumphant course of political advancement. In 1534, he was appointed secretary of state, and also master of the rolls. The same year, he became chancellor of the university of Cambridge. When the validity of the king's second marriage was opposed by Sir Thomas More, Cromwell, as a friend of that bigotted, but gentle and illustrious man, united with Cranmer, in attempting to prevail on him to yield in his resistance. Nor was their friendly attempt entirely without effect, though it was with such as ultimately proved insufficient to save Sir Thomas from his speedily approaching fate. Cromwell seemed to perceive the result of More's refusal, and declared that he would rather that his son had lost his head than that his friend should have declined the oath proposed to him. “ Cromwell,” adds a late biographer of More,³ with undue severity perhaps, “ Cromwell was not a good man, but the gentle virtue of More subdued even the bad.” Sir Thomas himself acknowledges that Cromwell “ tenderly favoured him.”

The attachment of Fisher, bishop of Rochester, to the delusion of ‘ the Maid of Kent,’ was another subject that, about this time, occupied the attention of Cromwell, who wrote the bishop a letter, urging him to ask the king's forgiveness, but sharp and severe in style, to a degree, indeed, which, in our own day would be reckoned insolent. In 1534, Henry, on being invested with ecclesiastical supremacy in England, appointed Cromwell his vicar-general and vice-gerent,⁴ in virtue of which, the king's supremacy was in a great degree committed to the minister, who carried on, by means of commissioners, a severe inquiry into the state of the English monasteries. Much discontent was created by the sweeping measures against the ecclesiastical institutions which Henry and his minister pursued. Cromwell, accordingly, was looked

³ Sir James Mackintosh, in *Lives of British Statesmen*, p. 91.

⁴ Burnet says, that for two years Cromwell was only *vicar-general*, but that after receiving a second commission in July 1536, he was called *vice-gerent*.

on with particular dislike, and in the northern rebellion of 1536, it was proposed by an assembly of the rebels, as one of their terms of agreement with the king, that he, as well as Audeley, the lord-chancellor, should be excluded from the next parliament. The king, in his reply to their address, denied that he had fewer of noble birth in his council then than were in it when he came to the crown, and stated that he and his council had thought it expedient to have members who understood English law and foreign treaties, and had accordingly brought in the lord-chancellor and Cromwell. Nor, probably, did the latter stretch his power to the utmost against the Romanists.⁵

When, amidst the ecclesiastical convulsions of Henry's eventful reign, religious doctrines were to be settled as well as religious institutions changed, the vicar-general supported the reformation by publishing certain articles of faith at decided variance with the Romish creed,—by encouraging a new translation of the Bible,—by prohibiting, in the king's name, pilgrimages, and other superstitions,—and by joining the duke of Suffolk and others in remonstrating with Henry against cruelty in the execution of 'the six articles' against heresy, passed in 1539. That infamous law the vicar-general himself had not succeeded in effectually resisting—whether or not from excess of caution in a matter which roused even Cranmer's mind to public opposition, it may be impossible to say. But five hundred persons being imprisoned in 1539, for the breach of these articles, Cromwell, along with Audeley and others, remonstrated with the king. Henry pardoned the prisoners, and, says Burnet, "I find no further proceeding upon this statute until Cromwell fell."⁶ When this act was passed, the king sent Cromwell, and also the dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, to console Cranmer for his disappointment on the occasion. If this, however, was an act of cordiality towards the archbishop, it seems to have failed of promoting friendly feeling between Cromwell and the duke of Norfolk; for it is recorded by Burnet,⁷ that on the former remarking that he had never liked the manners of his master Wolsey, and that, although the cardinal had meant, if created pope, to make him his admiral, he had resolved not to accept of the office and abandon his country, the duke declared that *he lied*.⁸

That Cromwell was, in many points attached to the doctrine of the Protestants there is no sufficient reason to deny. But, in 1538, he pronounced sentence against the schoolmaster Lambert, after the debate between the king and that reputed heretic, respecting the corporeal presence, had failed of leading the latter to recant. He had now been advanced to the peerage, and that honour, besides his appointment to the office of keeper of the privy-seal, and, thereafter, to that of chief-justice and the order of the garter, was crowned at last with the title of earl of Essex and the official post of lord-high-chamberlain; previously to which appointments he had been pronounced, in virtue of his ecclesiastical office, first in precedence of the officers of state. But the attainment of lofty honours prepared for his more miserable fall. He had taken an active part in recommending to the king a marriage with Anne of Cleves, in order, it is supposed, to subdue the popish party, which had gained considerable influence at court. The marriage took

⁵ History of the Reformation, book iii.

⁶ Burnet, book iii.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Burnet, book iii.

place, but it proved distasteful to the royal fancy; and Cromwell's connexion with the matter has been supposed to have led to his overthrow. It was after that marriage had been consummated, indeed, and even after Henry himself had expressed to Cromwell dissatisfaction with the queen, that the minister received from him the title of earl of Essex. Nor is it consistent, perhaps, with the frank and headstrong character of Henry, to suppose that his conferring that distinction was intended merely as a cloak to an actual intention of reducing his minister to ruin, or with the importance of the benefit conferred, to regard it as merely an instance of that "enforced ceremony," described by the poet, as usual "when love begins to sicken and decay."⁹ But the duke of Norfolk, who had long been opposed to Cromwell, and on whose daughter, Catharine Howard, Henry, about this time set his affections, is represented as using her influence to degrade his rival in the king's esteem; and although it was probably not until the crowning honours of Cromwell had been granted, that Henry's old regard for his servant was overthrown, yet, prepared by his passion for Catharine Howard, to view it as a matter of self-interest, that he should treat as well-founded, or even to regard as such, her insinuations against Cromwell, seconded, as perhaps they were, by others who looked on the favourite with an evil eye, he might be led to take a distorted view of Cromwell's conduct, in recommending to him a marriage with Anne of Cleves, and thus even hasten his minister to ruin. Nor is this explanation of the king's opposition to Cromwell inconsistent with attributing it, in some degree—as Bishop Burnet has done¹⁰—to an indisposition on the part of Henry to side with the German princes against the emperor, and a wish to rid himself of the blame of what had been considered wrong in his recent policy.

Norfolk, the enemy of Cromwell, was employed in arresting him. This he did at the council-table, and from the highest place of honour the unfortunate minister was carried to the tower. The day following, Cranmer wrote in his favour to Henry, declaring that he thought never had king of England such a servant. A bill of attainder, however, was brought into the house of lords on the 17th of June, and, on the 19th, read a second and a third time, and sent down to the commons. There it stopped, but a new bill was framed, sent up to the house of lords, and passed. The act of attainder declares that Cromwell had proved "the most corrupt traitor and deceiver of the king and the crown that had ever been known in his whole reign."

Harsh and subservient as his procedure on some occasions was, the unfortunate minister, in the days of his prosperity, had not been without such qualities of intellect and heart as may induce us to regard him, in the words of Hume, as "worthy of a better master and of a better fate." Defective as his early education was, he could speak and write in the German, French, and Italian languages, and his correspondence and political measures evince an energetic mind. Though he seems to have had many enemies—as might have been expected from the vigour,

⁹ We observe that Bishop Burnet is of the same opinion on this point. "This," says he, speaking of the fact that Cromwell was created earl of Essex, so late as the 14th of April, 1540, "This shows that the true cause of Cromwell's fall must be found in some other thing than his making up the king's marriage, who had never thus raised his title, if he had intended so soon to pull him down." *History of the Reformation*, Book iii.

¹⁰ Burnet, Book iii.

perhaps the inequitable vigour, of his measures, the meanness of his birth, and probably his subservience to the pleasure of the king—he was kind to his servants and charitable to the poor. He appears to have been remarkable for freedom from overbearing haughtiness towards his inferiors, and for the grateful recollection of benefits received at a humbler period of his life. Of the latter quality the following pleasing instance is recorded. When in Italy, being in great distress, on occasion of a defeat sustained by the French army at Castiglione, he was taken notice of by a merchant of the name of Frescobald, who gave him sixteen gold ducats, and provided for his passage to his native country. This charitable merchant was himself reduced to exigence, in which condition he was met, in England, by Cromwell, who, now a man of eminence, recognized and assisted him who, in earlier days, had so liberally befriended him. But neither the virtues nor the services of Cromwell prevailed on the king, to reverse his condemnation; although a letter, written from the tower, by the stricken minister, appealing in pathetic terms to the royal clemency, is said to have drawn tears from Henry's eyes. "The frail flesh," says the doleful prisoner, "incites me to call to your Grace, for mercy and pardon of mine offences." But mercy was denied, and, on the 28th of July, 1540, he was executed on Tower-hill. He acknowledged himself a sinner against God and his prince, and also confessed that he had been seduced from the true doctrine, declaring, at the same time, that he died in the Catholic faith. What he meant to intimate by this declaration it may be impossible to ascertain with certainty, but Burnet thinks that, by the Catholic faith, is to be understood, not the creed of the Popish church, but the Christian faith as separated from the novelties which that church had incorporated with it, and argues, from his praying in the English tongue, and only to God through Jesus Christ, that Cromwell was no papist.¹¹

Stafford, Duke of Buckingham.

DIED A. D. 1521.

EDWARD STAFFORD, duke of Buckingham, was the fifth in descent from Anne Plantagenet, daughter and heiress of Thomas of Woodstock, the youngest son of Edward III. All his ancestors for upwards of a century back had died violent deaths in the field or on the scaffold; and he was doomed to no milder fate. It is said that he had ventured to cast his eyes upon the crown, and that one Hopkins, prior of the charter house at Henton, who pretended to the gift of prophecy, had encouraged his vain hopes. His ambitious dreams were not unknown to Henry, who caused him to be arrested in 1521, on a charge of treason. Before the duke of Norfolk as high-steward and a jury of seven-

¹¹ *History of the Reformation*, book iii.—We know not whether Cromwell's confession at his execution dictated the following remark of an anonymous biographer of Cranmer,—a remark which seems scarcely consistent with the tenor of his life:—"Cromwell was not at heart a friend of the Reformation—but being hated and despised by the adherents of the old worship, he was thrown, by a spirit of revenge, among the leaders of the new learning."—*Lives of British Statesmen*, vol. i.

teen other peers, he was charged with having encouraged Hopkins to utter these pretended prophetic announcements of his future grandeur,—with having corrupted the fidelity and allegiance of the king's servants and endeavoured to attach some of them to his own interests,—and with having declared that, on the death of the king, he would make himself the first man in the realm, and bring Wolsey, and some others persons now in power, to the scaffold. Buckingham defended himself eloquently; he objected that nothing in the indictment amounted to an overt act of treason; and next attempted to confute the separate charges; but the evidence of Knivett, a discarded officer of his own household, and who had first furnished that information to Wolsey, which led to the duke's apprehension, united to that of Delacourt his confessor, and Perk his chancellor, was held to have established his guilt, and the peers having pronounced him guilty, Norfolk, with tears in his eyes, gave judgment of death against him. The prisoner heard his fate unmoved, and said: "My lord of Norfolk, you have said to me as a traitor should be said unto: but I was never none. Still, my lords, I nothing malign you for that you have done me. May the eternal God forgive you my death as I do! I shall never sue to the king for life, howbeit he is a gracious prince, and more grace may come from him than I desire. I desire you my lords, and also my fellows, to pray for me." He was beheaded on the 17th of May, 1551, amidst the tears of the surrounding spectators, who vented their detestation of Wolsey, whom they regarded as the author of Stafford's death, by loud cries of 'The butcher's son!'¹ "God have mercy on his soul!" says the reporter of his trial, "for he was a most wise and noble prince, and the mirror of all courtesy."

Seymour, Duke of Somerset.

DIED A. D. 1552.

EDWARD SEYMOUR, who became duke of Somerset and protector of England, was son of Sir John Seymour of Wolfhall, Wilts, who was also father of Jane Seymour, the wife of Henry VIII., and mother of Edward VI. The younger Seymour studied at Oxford, but in 1533, he attended the duke of Suffolk in a military expedition to France. In 1537, after the marriage of his sister to the English king, Seymour was created earl of Hertford, having previously been raised, in succession, to the honour of knighthood and the title of Lord Beauchamp. In 1540 he became knight of the garter, and in 1542, he was constituted lord-chamberlain for life. The same year, along with many other nobles, he attended the duke of Norfolk in his advance on the Scottish borders; and in 1544, he himself commanded an army against Scotland, on which occasion the English troops, landing near Leith, plundered and set fire to Edinburgh, and being joined by an additional force, destroyed the towns of Haddington and Dunbar, and returned to England, having lost, in the campaign, but forty men. In 1546, he succeeded the earl of Surrey in the government of Boulogne.

The demise of Henry VIII., in the following year, advanced the earl

¹ Lingard, vol. iv. p. 60.

of Hertford to a higher trust. He was one of the sixteen executors to whom Henry had committed the care of his son and successor, Edward VI., who, at his father's death, was only in the tenth year of his age, and, on that occasion, at a meeting of Henry's executors and council, it was proposed that a protector of the kingdom should be chosen, who should be under the control of the executors. In spite of the opposition of Wriothesley, the chancellor, the plan was approved of. The earl of Hertford, uncle to the young king, was chosen to the office, created duke of Somerset, lord-treasurer, and earl-mareschal; and, though a layman, invested with ecclesiastical preferment. In March a patent, signed by the young king, entrusted to Somerset, assisted by a council, composed of the councillors appointed by the late king, Wriothesley excepted,¹ with regal power. To this arrangement the executors submitted, although, according to Mr Hume, "as the patent, by its very tenor, where the executors are not so much as mentioned, appears to have been surreptitiously obtained from a minor king, the protectorship of Somerset was a plain usurpation, which it is impossible by any arguments to justify."

Hertford, like his sister Lady Jane Seymour, was attached to the interests of the Reformation, and in Archbishop Crammer he had a coadjutor of similar views. Besides that the individuals concerned in the education of the young king were of the reformed faith, the protector, by a proclamation, appointed a visitation of the dioceses for the correction of vice and superstition. Homilies were issued for the use of the clergy, and restrictions put on the service of the pulpit. In these measures the protector met with opposition from Bonner, bishop of London, Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and Tunstal, bishop of Durham. But soon thereafter the council went still farther in the work of innovation on the ancient worship, abolishing several superstitious ceremonies, and ordering images to be removed from the churches—a course in which the parliament of 1549 proceeded, by establishing an English liturgy and allowing the marriage of priests. It is to be regretted, however, that the protector's administration was disgraced, according to the illiberal ideas of the time, by persecution for religious faith, inasmuch that, in one case—the condemnation of Joan of Kent for reputed heresy on the incarnation—young Edward, when called to sign the warrant for her death, was induced to weep, after in vain contending with the archbishop, his sterner counsellor.

But before the work of reforming the religion of the country had been completed, the protector had taken steps in another direction. The scheme of Henry for a marriage between Edward and Mary the daughter of the late Scottish king, was also supported by Somerset. Having published a manifesto representing the importance of a union being established between England and Scotland, and having prepared an army of 18,000 men, besides a fleet of 60 ships, on the pretext of revenging aggressions committed on the English border, he refused to negotiate with Scotland, unless on the condition of such a marriage being agreed to by the Scots. His manifesto failed of producing the effect,

¹ This nobleman had been previously condemned to a fine, and imprisonment in his own house, besides the forfeiture of his office as chancellor, on account of exercising it by a commission authorised and appointed by himself.

and on the 2d of September, 1548, he passed, at the head of his army, into Scotland. After causing certain small castles on the way to surrender, he met with an army mustered by Arran, now governor of Scotland, and double the number of his own, in the neighbourhood of the Scottish capital. In a skirmish on the occasion, the English army had the advantage; but on Somerset and the earl of Warwick, by whom he was accompanied, examining the camp of the Scottish army, it appeared that to engage with them in regular action would be an enterprise of danger, and, instead of attempting it without another effort of reconciliation, the protector wrote to Arran, and offered to withdraw his troops, and repair the damage he had done, if the young queen were not betrothed to a foreign prince, nor sent abroad until of an age when she might choose a consort for herself. The proposal was rejected. On Somerset moving towards the sea, the Scots believed the English troops were seeking to embark, quitted their advantageous ground, and came down into the plain. On this artillery began to fire from the English ships. Lord Grey making an irregular movement, the onset of his men-at-arms failed of making an adequate impression on the Scots. But Somerset, with other officers, rallied the troops, and on the combined movement of the English forces, alarm struck the van and then the body and rear of the Scottish army, who betook themselves to flight, and many of whom fell in the pursuit. The total number lost by the Scots on this occasion has been computed at upwards of 10,000, while Somerset was left not only master of the field, but with an army which had not lost above two hundred men. After this celebrated battle, fought at Pinkey, on Arran's requesting a negotiation respecting peace, Warwick was left with authority to confer on the subject, and Somerset, after taking several castles, returned to England, and convened a parliament, the laws enacted by which have been much commended.

During Somerset's absence in Scotland, a rival appeared in the person of his own brother, Admiral Lord Seymour, whose fortune and fate will be related in a separate article. But if one danger by which Somerset was threatened disappeared with his brother's death, it was succeeded by others both to him and to the country. England was now disturbed by insurrections occasioned by the privations of the people. These were subdued, but young Mary of Scotland had been sent over to France, and troops had been sent by that country to the assistance of the Scots. Somerset, at war both with France and Scotland, was disposed to make peace with both. But from the power which he had assumed, he was become an object of dissatisfaction among his councillors, nor was the favour of the people—although he seems to have aimed at being popular—entirely on his side. His former companion the earl of Warwick, together with the earls of Southampton and Arundel, all members of the council, met at Ely-house, and acted independently of Somerset, issuing injunctions to public officers to obey their orders, and requesting other noblemen to join them in their efforts. Next day they were joined by several members of the council. Somerset, on hearing of the peril, caused the king to be removed from Hampton court to Windsor, and armed his followers for a defence. He received, however, small support. The duke capitulated, and was committed to the tower along with some of his adherents. An indictment was drawn up, charging him with usurpation. He confessed to the

council, on his knees, the truth of all the articles, and signed a declaration on the subject. Parliament received the document, took away from him his offices, and imposed on him a fine in land of £2,000 a year. But the latter penalty was remitted, and the duke was readmitted to the council; and Warwick, who had now risen to eminence among that body, agreed that his son should marry Somerset's daughter. But no permanent friendship was sealed betwixt the duke and that ambitious nobleman. Certain expressions used by the latter respecting Warwick being reported, the duke, his duchess, and certain of his friends and dependents were imprisoned in October, 1551. Somerset was accused by Sir Thomas Palmer, a spy, of a design to create an insurrection, to take possession of the tower, and even to murder Northampton, Pembroke, and Warwick himself, who had now been created earl of Northumberland. He was tried before the marquess of Winchester, high steward, on the charge of high treason, before a jury of twenty peers. They returned a verdict favourable to the accused, in respect of the charge of treason; but sentence of death was pronounced on that of having intended to make an assault on privy councillors. The duke acknowledged that he had expressed such an intention, but stated that he had not seriously resolved on the execution of it, and asked pardon of the nobles whom he had aggrieved. He was executed on the 22d of January, 1552. Great sorrow and respect were testified on occasion of his death, and the spectators even to the last had some anticipation of a pardon. But Edward had been guarded against the influence of his uncle's friends. That excellent prince survived the protector only about a year and a half, and the execution of Northumberland, a few weeks after his young master's death, was accompanied with popular accusations of his severity to Somerset. That the latter nobleman assumed more power than was legitimate there seems too much reason to believe; but it is due, perhaps, to his general character to refrain from the opinion that, although he may, naturally, have been irritated by the attempts to sink him from the elevation he had reached, he had a direct and deliberate intention to murder any of his opponents in the council. Like his sister Lady Jane, he seems to have possessed an amiable cast of character, which experience has, in other cases, proved to be consistent with an undue desire of eminence and power. The part he took in favour of the Reformation entitles him to the regard of Protestants; and his conduct of the Scottish war, how insufficient soever may have been the grounds on which it was begun, is fitted to give us a favourable impression of his military skill. A book said to have been written by him during confinement in the tower, is entitled—"A spiritual and most precious pearl, teaching all men to love and embrace the cross as a most sweet and necessary thing."

Thomas, Lord Seymour.

DIED A. D. 1548

THOMAS SEYMOUR was a man of more ambition and less prudence than his brother, the protector. Sharing in the good fortunes of his family during the reign of Henry VIII. he received the honour of

knighthood from that monarch, along with considerable pecuniary grants, which enabled him to increase his personal influence, and thus foster mere day-dreams of aggrandisement, which ultimately brought him to the scaffold. On his brother's elevation to the protectorship Sir Thomas was created Lord Seymour of Dudley, and soon after lord-high-admiral of England. But these appointments failed to satisfy the ambitious courtier, and he gradually involved himself in a series of deep intrigues against the administration of his own brother. He had paid court to Catherine Parr while she was Lady Latimer, and his suit would probably have been successful but for the interference of so formidable a rival as England's monarch himself. Encouraged by what he had already known of Catherine's sentiments, he ventured to renew his suit to her, almost before the grave had closed on her royal husband; and she consented to become his wife with a precipitation highly indecorous and reprehensible, and which exposed Seymour himself to the formidable charge conveyed in these words,—“You married the late queen so soon after the late king's death that, if she had conceived straight after, it would have been a doubt whether the child was the king's or yours,—to the peril of the succession.”

The jealousy of the two brothers gathered new strength from that of their wives. The protector was notoriously under the influence of his wife, Ann Stanhope, a woman of strong and headlong passions, who could not brook the precedence allowed by all others to Catherine as the first female in the kingdom. The queen-dowager maintained her own rights with equal resolution. Their husbands were induced to take part in their quarrel, and the consequences which might have been easily anticipated instantly followed,—alienation, suspicion, hatred, took possession of their hearts, and the younger Seymour was treated as all but a declared rebel by his offended brother. The protector and council now refused to the lord-admiral certain lands and valuable jewels which he claimed as bequests to his wife from the late king. This and other disappointments exasperated the admiral, and he instantly plunged himself into designs against the existing government, which placed his life in extreme jeopardy for a time. An apparent reconciliation between the brothers was at last effected, and the admiral was compelled to change, though not to renounce, his ambitious projects.

The princess Elizabeth had been committed, on the death of her father, to the care of the queen-dowager, and usually resided with her at one or other of her jointure-houses. By this means it happened that, after the queen's marriage with Seymour, Elizabeth found herself domesticated under the roof of the lord-admiral. The latter seems to have behaved towards the young princess in a very extraordinary and unbecoming manner, though it does not appear that he had formed any design of aspiring to her hand at this early period of their intercourse. It is difficult to account for Catherine's own conduct in this matter. She appears to have been sadly deficient in delicacy at least, for she encouraged her young charge to romp and sport with young Seymour in a manner altogether unbefitting the parties; and it was not until the occurrence of some circumstances which violently excited the dowager-queen's jealousy, that an altercation took place between the royal step-mother and step-daughter which, fortunately for the honour of Elizabeth, ended in an instant and final separation. The death of Catherine

in September, 1547, soon after this affair, led to a rumour that she was poisoned by her husband, for which, however, there is no evidence.

Seymour, still bent on schemes of ambition, seems now to have hesitated in his matrimonial projects betwixt Lady Jane Grey, the eldest daughter of the marchioness of Dorset, who had been placed immediately after the two princesses in order of succession to the crown, and the princess Elizabeth herself. But as it was evident that the removal of his sister from the head of the administration must precede the accomplishment of either of these ambitious designs, he engaged in a series of measures for forming a party against his brother among the leading nobility. He likewise opened a secret correspondence with the young king; and such was his imprudence, that he began openly to boast of his superior influence and authority in the state. In the midst of his flattering anticipations, his plots were discovered, and himself, with his principal agents, committed to the tower. No overt act of treason could be proved against him; but, on the 27th of February, 1549, a bill of attainder was passed against him; his request to be heard in his own defence having first been refused. On the 17th of next month, the warrant for his execution was issued, with his brother's name at the head of the signatures to it, and three days thereafter he was beheaded on Tower-hill. He met his fate with a courage approaching to ferocity. Bishop Latimer says he "died very dangerously, irksomely, horribly; so that his end was suitable to his life, which was very mean, profane, and irreligious."

It is difficult at this distance of time to calculate what might have been the consequence had this ambitious and restless nobleman been allowed to prosecute his designs. That Elizabeth evinced an attachment to Seymour has been pretty clearly established, although she is said to have refused permission to the admiral to visit her after the death of his wife. A gentleman of the name of Harrington, who had been in Seymour's service, was subsequently taken by Elizabeth into her own household, and highly favoured; and with so much security did this person reckon on the princess's tenderness for the memory of Seymour that he ventured, several years after her accession to the throne, to present her with a portrait of him, under which was inscribed the following sonnet:—

“ Of person rare, strong limbs, and manly shape,
By nature framed to serve on sea or land;
In friendship firm, in good state or ill-hap;
In peace, head wise; in war, skill great, bold hand;
On horse or foot, in peril or in play,
None could excel, though many did essay;
A subject true to king, a servant great,
Friend to God's truth, a foe to Rome's deceit;
Sumptuous abroad, for honour of the land;
Temp'rate at home, yet kept great state with stay,
And noble house, that fed more mouths with meat
Than some advanced on higher steps to stand.
Yet, against nature, reason, and just laws,
His blood was spilt, guiltless, without just cause.”

Edward VI.

BORN A. D. 1537.—DIED A. D. 1553.

EDWARD was only nine years old when proclaimed king of England, in 1547, and he died in the seventh year of his reign, his government was therefore, to all practical purposes, a regency, and it is to the memoirs of the protector, Somerset, and his successor, Northumberland, that we must look for the political features of this period of English history. Edward's character, as far as it was developed, was a pleasing one; and until the appearance of that disease which soon indicated itself in his constitution, he gave promise of a mild and beneficent reign. Towards both his sisters he conducted himself with admirable prudence and delicacy; and although much of the praise in this instance was unquestionably due to the discretion of his guardians, yet his affectionate and mild temper spontaneously dictated to him that line of conduct which he pursued towards the two princesses. He did not indeed conceal his preference for Elizabeth whom he used to call his 'sweet sister Temperance,' but he never could be induced, without the greatest reluctance, to consent to any of those harsh measures which were adopted by his guardians against Mary on account of her religious sentiments; nor should we be justified in considering the severe proceedings which were instituted against the prelates of her party, as emanating from the youthful prince, who, with all his predilections in favour of Protestantism, wept whenever he was compelled to give his sanction to any measures having the appearance of harshness or cruelty. The humane temper of Cranmer harmonized with Edward's gentleness; and the Catholic historian, Dod, confesses, that during this reign, "no sanguinary, but only penal laws were executed on those who stood off." The languishing state of Edward's health encouraged and precipitated the daring policy of Northumberland, who succeeded in persuading him to change the succession in favour of Lady Jane Grey. He had been seized, in 1552, first with measles, and then with small pox; but having perfectly recovered, he made a progress through some parts of the kingdom, in the following year. But whilst thus engaged, he was seized with a cough which was speedily succeeded by more certain symptoms of disorder in the lungs. The celebrated Jerome Cardan, who had been sent for from Italy to cure the archbishop of St Andrews, was consulted in Edward's case. Cardan did not choose to exercise his medical skill upon the royal patient, but he did what he probably thought would prove more satisfactory to all parties, he cast his horoscope, and predicted from it a speedy recovery and long reign for the prince. We are indebted to this extraordinary man for a character of Edward, which, as it was written when the author could have no hopes of recompense from any quarter, and by a man of no ordinary attainments and sagacity, may be relied on as presenting us with a more faithful account of the prince, so far as it goes, than any thing which could be extracted from the writings of his fulsome panegyrists:—"He knew," says Cardan, "Latin and French well; was not ignorant of Greek, Italian, and Spanish; and was not without a competent knowledge of logic, of physics, and of music. A boy of such genius and expectation was a prodigy

in human affairs. I do not speak," he adds, "with rhetorical exaggeration, but rather speak under the truth." In our general introductory sketch of this period we have given some additional information, from the same quarter, relative to the youthful Edward's learning and accomplishments. On the 6th of July, 1553, "towards nighte," this amiable and accomplished prince breathed his last, in his palace at Greenwich. "His position in English history," says Mackintosh, "between a tyrant and a bigot, adds somewhat to the grace of his innocent and attractive character, which borrows also an additional charm from the mild lustre which surrounds the name of Lady Jane Grey, the companion of his infancy, and the object of his dying choice as a successor on the throne."

Dudley, Duke of Northumberland.

BORN A. D. 1502.—DIED A. D. 1553.

JOHN DUDLEY, duke of Northumberland, was the son of Edmund Dudley, the corrupt minister of Henry VII. He engaged in military service under Charles Brandon duke of Suffolk, and was knighted by him for gallant conduct during the campaign in France. On his return to England he was successively patronised by Wolsey, Cromwell, and Ann of Cleves; yet inauspicious as such patronage might have been esteemed, we find him, in 1542, on the death of his father-in-law, created Viscount Lyle by the capricious Henry, and soon after invested with the order of the garter, and the office of lord-high-admiral of England. In the latter capacity he conducted a formidable armament against Holland, and some time afterwards made a still more signal display of his capabilities in defeating the efforts of France to invade England, and compelling Francis I. to consent to the treaty of 1545.

On the death of Henry, Dudley aimed at the protectorship, but was defeated by Somerset, and from this period may be dated the mortal enmity of these two powerful nobles. One of the protector's first acts was to confer the office of high-admiral on his own brother. Dudley sought to conceal his mortification under the show of a voluntary resignation of that office; and the protector himself hastened to tender him some compensation by appointing him grand-chamberlain of England, and conferring on him the title of earl of Warwick with a gift of the castle and manor of that town. But these honours, though something more than a name, sufficed not to soothe the irritated feelings which rankled in Dudley's bosom. And although he rendered several important services to the protectorate, especially during the war in Scotland, yet he readily attached himself to the party which ultimately drove Somerset from the government. The Catholic party now flattered themselves that the earl of Warwick would espouse their cause, but they were disappointed: the earl had marked the spirit of the young king and the temper of the times too well to lend himself to such a sinking interest.

In 1551, Warwick was raised to the dignity of duke of Northumberland. That title had already remained some years dormant; but it was not destined to descend to the heirs of the new duke. We have in

a preceding article adverted to the supposed part which Dudley took in hastening the execution of Somerset. His own fall was then nearer than he suspected. In the very noonday of his power and fancied popularity, the youthful prince in whose name he held and directed the reins of government, was seized with a disease which soon put on the appearance of a rapid decline. Northumberland instantly perceived his critical situation. From Mary, who stood next heir to the crown, he had nothing to hope for, but every thing to dread. To the religious principles which he had espoused, she was known to be decidedly hostile; and he had always taken such a prominent part in every act of harshness towards that princess that she could not but entertain a strong personal aversion towards him. In these circumstances he resolved on the bold but desperate line of policy, which we shall have occasion to relate with some fulness of detail in our memoir of Lady Jane Grey. The result, as might have been foreseen by a man placed in less desperate circumstances than Dudley, was fatal to his whole party. Deserted by his partisans and soldiers, his next step was to make a merit of necessity by being the first man to throw up his cap in the market-place of Cambridge, and cry "God save Queen Mary!" On the following day he was arrested by the earl of Arundel; and on the 22d of August, 1553, he suffered execution on Tower-hill.

Lady Jane Grey.

BORN A. D. 1537.—DIED A. D. 1554.

FEW personages in British history have attracted a more universal sympathy from all classes of readers than the amiable, but unfortunate Lady Jane Grey. Her illustrious parentage, her beauty, her accomplishments, her amiable temper, the unsullied purity of her motives, her extreme youth, and finally the fortitude with which she encountered death in one of its most appalling forms, have all contributed to invest her with a deep though melancholy interest to which we can do but imperfect justice in the following sketch. Lady Jane Grey was the eldest daughter of Henry Grey, marquess of Dorset. Her mother, the lady Frances Brandon, was niece of Henry VIII., and, consequently, she herself was first cousin, once removed, to Edward VI. She was born about the year 1537 at Bradgate, in Leicestershire. Her early education was conducted by her father's chaplains, Harding and Aylmer, both men of distinguished learning; for a part also of her acquirements she was indebted to the celebrated Roger Ascham. Under the tuition of these eminent men, she is said to have made eminent progress in her studies. Her eulogist represents her as speaking Latin, Italian, French, and Greek, with elegance and fluency, and as well acquainted also with Hebrew, Chaldee, and Arabic. But these statements must be received with some degree of qualification. That her attainments were great and far exceeded those of most of her sex, need not be questioned; but it is absurd to suppose, that within the brief compass of her life, she could make such acquisitions in learning as some of her biographers ascribe to her. Ascham, however, assures us, that on visiting her family in the month of August 1550, he

found Lady Jane alone in her apartment, reading the *Phædo* of Plato in the original. This circumstance astonished and pleased the worthy pedagogue above measure; and he mentions it in his correspondence with Sturmius, in terms which reflect equal honour on the good man's enthusiasm for 'the divine *Phædo* of the divine Plato,' and on the fair student herself.

Lady Jane's attachment to the reformed faith was early evinced in the correspondence which she maintained with some of the most eminent reformers on the continent. There are still extant several Latin epistles from her to Henry Bullenger, which, it is certain, were all written before her marriage. Her first appearance in public, was in her mother's train on the occasion of the visit of Mary, the dowager-queen of Scotland, to the court at Greenwich. Shortly afterwards she became the guest of the princess Mary, whom she unconsciously offended by the freedom of some of her remarks on Catholic ceremonies and tenets. About the end of May 1553, Lady Jane was married to Lord Guildford Dudley, fourth son of the duke of Northumberland. Her ambitious father-in-law now prevailed on Edward to make a new settlement of the throne in favour of the house of Suffolk. The grounds on which this alteration was effected, were extremely plausible. The title of Edward himself was left intact; but the hereditary right of succession in Mary and Elizabeth was taken away by simply revising the statutes which had declared Henry's first and second marriage void. After Elizabeth, Henry had placed the descendants of Mary, queen of France, passing over her eldest sister Margaret. Mary of France, by her second marriage with Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, had two daughters, Lady Frances, who married Henry Grey, marquis of Dorset, afterwards created duke of Suffolk, and Lady Eleanor, who wedded Henry Clifford, earl of Cumberland. Henry afterwards settled the crown by his will on the heirs of those two ladies successively, failing his own children. Taking advantage of these circumstances, and of Edward's ardent attachment to the principles of the Reformation, Northumberland alternately wrought upon the young prince's fears and hopes by reminding him that it was a duty which he owed not less to his God than to his country to make provision for the maintenance and security of the Protestant religion after his death, and, at the same time, enlarging upon Mary's zealous attachment to the Catholic faith, and the little security there was even for Elizabeth's adherence to the principles of Protestantism. To the powerful house of Suffolk alone, he argued, could the securities of the Protestant faith be safely intrusted at this crisis, and in the person of Lady Jane Grey was that union of principles and of rights to be found, which pointed her out as the fit successor of a Protestant monarch upon the throne of England. Northumberland's insidious reasonings prevailed with the mild and timid prince; and on the 9th of July, 1553, he communicated to his daughter-in-law the tidings of Edward's death, and of her own elevation to the throne.

Though not wholly unprepared for the intelligence, we are told that she fainted at the announcement, and at first resolutely refused the proffered dignity. Afterwards, describing the transaction in a letter to Mary, she says:—"As soon as I had, with infinite pain to my

mind, understood these things, how much I remained beside myself, stunned and agitated, I leave to these lords to testify who saw me fall to the ground, and who know how grievously I wept." Heylyn informs us that "Northumberland's speech being ended, the poor lady found herself in great perplexity, not knowing whether she would more lament the death of the king, or her adoption to the kingdom; the first loss not to be repaired: the next case possible to be avoided. She looked upon the crown as a great temptation, to resist which she stood in need of all the helps which both philosophy and divinity could suggest unto her. And she knew also that such fortunes seldom knocked twice for entrance at the same man's gate; but that if once refused, they are gone for ever. Taking some time, therefore, for deliberation, she summoned a council of her purest thoughts, by whose advice, half drowned in tears, (either as in sorrow for the king's death, or foreseeing her own,) she returned an answer in these words, or to this effect: — 'That the laws of the kingdom, and natural right standing for the king's sister, she would beware of burthening her weak conscience with a yoke which did belong to them; that she understood the infamy of those who had permitted the violation of right to gain a sceptre; that it were to mock God and deride justice; to scruple at the stealing of a shilling, and not at the usurpation of a crown.' 'Besides,' said she, 'I am not so young, nor so little read in the guiles of fortune, as to suffer myself to be taken by them. If she enrich any, it is but to make them the subjects of her spoil; if she raise others, it is but to pleasure herself with their ruins. What she adored but yesterday, to-day is her pastime. And if I now permit her to adorn and crown me, I must to-morrow suffer her to crush and tear me to pieces. Nay, with what crown doth she present me? A crown which hath been violently and shamefully wrested from Catharine of Arragon, made more unfortunate by the punishment of Ann Bulloign and others, that wore it after her. And why then would you have me add my blood to theirs, and be the third victim from whom this fatal crown may be ravished with the head that wears it? But in case it should not prove fatal to me, and that all its venom were consumed; if fortune should give me warranties of her constancy; should I be well advised to take upon me these thorns, which would dilacerate, though not kill me outright; to burthen myself with a crown which would not fail to torment me, though I were assured not to be strangled with it? My liberty is better than the chain you proffer me, with what precious stones soever it be adorned, or of what gold soever framed. I will not exchange my peace for honourable and precious jealousies, for magnificent and glorious fetters. And if you love me sincerely, and in good earnest, you will rather wish me a secure and quiet fortune, though mean, than an exalted condition exposed to the wind, and followed by some dismal fall.'" But the ambition of relatives would not allow her to follow the prudent counsel of her own thoughts and feelings in this matter. Her husband was prevailed on to "add the accents of love to the wiles of ambition;" and beyond this female fortitude could not be expected to go.

On the same day Jane was proclaimed at London, and Mary at Norwich, and both simultaneously issued their commands to the lord-lieutenants and sheriffs of counties, to march the power of the nation to their respective standards. The result is well known. Northum-

berland's supineness allowed Mary's friends to assemble in preponderating numbers, and this fact was no sooner understood than it turned the balance in Mary's favour, for the great mass of the public, including the citizens of London, stood aloof at first from both parties, waiting until it should become apparent which party was likely to prove victorious in the approaching struggle. The first person who acquainted Lady Jane with the fatal turn of events, was her own father, who, entering her apartment, told her that her cause was lost, and that she must now divest herself of her royal robes, and be contented to return to a private station. She received the announcement with composure, and meekly replied:—"I better brook this message than my former advancement to royalty; out of obedience to you and my mother I have grievously sinned, and offered violence to myself. Now I do willingly, and as obeying the motions of my soul, relinquish the crown, and endeavour to salve those faults committed by others, if at least so great a fault can be salved, by a relinquishment and ingenuous acknowledgment of them." Soon after Mary's coronation, measures were adopted for the arraignment of Lady Jane and her husband, together with Lord Ambrose Dudley, and Lord Henry Dudley, her brothers-in-law; and on the 3d of November their trial commenced. All were convicted of high treason, and sentence of death was pronounced on each of them. If Mary ever entertained purposes of mercy towards the hapless couple, Wyatt's ill-concerted rebellion sealed their fate. On the 8th of February, 1554, Mary signed a warrant for the execution of "Guildford Dudley and his wife," as the illustrious pair were uncourteously designated. Feckenham, the queen's confessor, was sent to announce to Lady Jane the awful tidings, that she must prepare herself to die on the following day. That priest betrayed great solicitude to induce the unfortunate lady to renounce her religion, and even obtained a reprieve of three days for her, to afford him an opportunity of fully discussing the articles of her faith with her. Different accounts have been given of the abbot's conduct in this matter, some representing him as evincing an affectionate but respectful solicitude for what he conceived to be the spiritual interests of the youthful prisoner; and others, as pushing his zeal for her conversion to the verge of brutality and rudeness. All accounts, however, agree in representing Lady Jane as adhering with the constancy and calmness of a martyr at the stake to her religious principles. The last evening of her life was spent by her in fervent devotion, with an interruption of two hours, occasioned by the arrival of two bishops and some other Catholic priests, who, even at this late moment, intruded their services upon her in the hopes of effecting her conversion. She bore their intrusion with meekness, but remained unmoved by their arguments. On the same evening, she wrote a Greek letter to her sister, Lady Catharine, on a blank leaf in her Greek Testament, and, next morning, Lord Guildford solicited and obtained the queen's consent to an interview with his wife; but Lady Jane declined to see him, afraid lest their parting scene should overcome the fortitude of both, and dispossess their minds of that firmness which was now more than ever necessary to bear them through their last moments with dignity and composure. She reminded him by message, that their separation would be but for a moment, and that they would soon rejoin each other in a scene where neither disappoint-

ment nor suffering could ever interrupt their eternal felicity. It had^d been originally intended that the hapless pair should suffer together on Tower-hill, but the council, wisely dreading the effect which such an exhibition might have on the populace, changed their orders, and determined that Lord Guildford only should be executed on that spot, and that Lady Jane should suffer within the precincts of the tower. Dudley met his fate with considerable dignity and fortitude. The sheriffs then announced to Lady Jane that they were ready to attend her to the scaffold. She was conducted to the place of execution by Sir John Brydges, the lieutenant of the tower. On reaching the scaffold, she mounted it without hesitation, and addressed the spectators in a short speech, in which she admitted her crime against the queen, but declared that in what she had done, she had only consented to the thing which she was enforced unto by the persuasion of others; she then confessed herself a sinner, and declared that she hoped for salvation only through the mercy of God in the merits of the blood of his Son Jesus Christ, and concluded her speech by requesting the spectators to assist her with their prayers. She then knelt down, and repeated the "*Miserere mei Deus*," after which, she arose and prepared herself for the axe. Having arranged her dress, and had her eyes bandaged, she was guided to the block, on which she laid her head, exclaiming, "Lord, into thy hands I commend my spirit!" and at one blow the executioner separated her head from her body.

Mary K.

BORN A. D. 1516.—DIED A. D. 1558.

THIS princess, the daughter of Henry VIII. and Catharine of Arragon, was born in 1516. In 1518, she was betrothed to the dauphin of France, and Tournay, a French town conquered by her father, assigned as her dowry. In 1521, however, she was engaged to the emperor, Charles V.; and again—so variable was the face of politics and the disposition of the English king—it was agreed, by a treaty of 1527, that she should be married either to Francis, the French monarch, or to the duke of Orleans, his son. But in the fate of Catharine that of her daughter was involved, and shortly after Henry's marriage with Anne Boleyn, and the birth of his second daughter Elizabeth, parliament, declaring the previous marriage with Catharine null, transferred from her issue the right of succession to the throne. Mary, however, was soon to have a partner in this loss of hereditary rank—her sister Elizabeth herself; for in 1536, after the execution of Anne Boleyn, Henry's issue both by her and by Catharine were pronounced illegitimate. Yet—for such are the changing features and contending destinies of life where its fortunes depend on the lordly caprice of tyrants and the shifting character of courts—it seems that the fall of Anne, involving the degradation of Elizabeth, opened a way for Mary's restoration to favour with the king. This—from which, it is said, she had been previously excluded on account of her popish sentiments—was granted by her imperious and dogmatic father, on her acknowledging, after considerable resistance, the supremacy of the king, the correctness of his

theological opinions, and the illegitimacy of his marriage with her own mother Catharine. In 1544, after the birth of Prince Edward, she and Elizabeth were placed immediately after the king's male issue in the order of succession to the crown.

Mary has been said to have been educated under the care of the unfortunate countess of Salisbury, along with her son, the celebrated Cardinal Pole, between whom and Mary a tender attachment is alleged to have been formed. However this may be, the tenor of Mary's life bears witness to her firm, and perhaps it is but fair to say, her sincere adherence to the Romish faith. The degree in which her character was formed by her religious faith, and that in which her faith was determined by the native constitution of her mind, it may not be easy to discover. But there is not wanting a certain air of dignity—sadly prostituted, yet not, perhaps, unfit to relieve the darker annals of her reign—in the part she took in reference to religion under the short administration of her brother Edward VI. Zealous as Mary was about religion, however, she is represented as paying an undue regard to dress, and if she loved splendour in the service of the church, she showed an attachment to it also as an ornament to her own person.

In July, 1553, while on her way to visit the king in his sickness, she first received information, from the earl of Arundel, both of Edward's death and of the plot against her own succession. On this she proposed to make her escape to Flanders, should she find herself unable to support her right, but took measures to have herself proclaimed, and called for assistance to her cause. The result of the brief struggle which ensued has been already detailed. One may feel inclined to reflect, while acknowledging the legitimacy of Mary's claim, how different a reign from hers might have been that of the pious and accomplished Lady Jane, had Providence, instead of removing her from the rude elements of political life, permitted her to occupy the English throne. Yet after all, a man like Northumberland might have stained the work which Gardiner and Bonner sought to overthrow, and lessons of human weakness and intolerance, precious truly, though, in this case, fearfully enforced, might have been less deeply graven for posterity to learn. The Protestant cause, considerably forwarded under Edward by Cranmer and other influential agents in the work of religious reformation, became an object of attack at the very outset of his sister's reign. Bonner, Gardiner, Tunstal, and others were restored to their bishoprics,—silence was imposed on all preachers except those who should receive a license,—several Protestant prelates were imprisoned,—contrary to law, masses were revived by clergymen attached to the Romish faith,—revenge was taken on the very bones of foreign Protestants,—many adherents of that now endangered cause departed from the country,—and the very first of Mary's parliaments, which met on the 5th of October, was opened with a mass, and besides declaring legitimate Henry's marriage with Catharine, repealed the statutes respecting religion passed in Edward's reign. This very parliament, however, was represented by Gardiner, who was now chancellor, as not, by any means, inclined to restore, in all respects, the state of things which Mary, as a Roman Catholic, may have desired, and they even appointed a committee to expostulate with the queen against marrying, as she now proposed to do, Philip, the son of Charles

V. Articles of marriage, however, were prepared, which, on the whole, failed to satisfy the people, although it was proposed that the royal power was to be vested wholly in the queen. Against this match a declaration was published by Sir Thomas Wyatt, and he, the earl of Suffolk, Sir Peter Carew, and Sir George Harper were active in promoting a rebellion against the queen's authority. The insurrections were subdued; but although Mary granted pardon to four hundred of the rioters who were brought before her with ropes around their necks, this disturbance led to the execution of an immense number of persons, including Lady Jane Grey. Of Elizabeth too, towards whom the queen had behaved unkindly, she now appeared to be suspicious, and that princess was first sent to the tower, and then superintended in various residences by persons appointed by the court. On the 5th of April, 1554, another parliament assembled. They confirmed the articles of marriage, but carefully set aside the claim of the Spanish prince to any legal authority in England, besides omitting to pass certain bills directed against the Protestant faith.

On the 19th of July, after fears and anxious wishes on the part of Mary, who, cruel as are the transactions of her reign, appears to have been very liable to the excitement of the tender passion, Philip, her intended husband, reached Southampton. On the 27th, they were married by Bishop Gardiner, at Winchester, and the ceremony was followed by a public entry into London. Towards Philip, though apparently he was by no means popular during his residence in England, the queen seems to have entertained feelings of somewhat romantic tenderness. Parliament, however, declined agreeing to her proposal, that her husband should be crowned, although they made it treasonable to attempt his death, and although she gained another point by their agreeing on the representation of her favourite Cardinal Pole, who had come over as a legate from the pope, to renew the connection of England with the papal see, and reviving laws against heresy. Nor did these laws remain a dead letter; they were executed, at the instigation of Gardiner, and contrary to the milder views or feelings of Cardinal Pole, with terrible severity. It is reckoned that, during three years in the course of this bloody work, carried on by Gardiner and his associate Bonner—a name justly infamous for brutal cruelty—277 suffered at the stake, besides other punishments for imputed heresy.

Mary also aimed at the restoration of the ecclesiastical property of which the church had been deprived; a proposal for which was made by the pope, and on the suggestion in the council that by such a measure the crown would be a loser, she answered, that she preferred the saving of her soul to the possessing ten such realms as England. After great opposition in the house of commons, her object was enforced by act of parliament towards the end of 1555. She proceeded to make heavy impositions on her subjects to supply her husband Philip, who had gone to his father the emperor, and who seems to have lost, if he ever possessed, attachment to his consort. In spite of his solicitations, Mary declined to continue an attempt to induce her sister Elizabeth to marry the duke of Savoy; but in March, 1556, another act of persecution occurred in the death of Cranmer, on which occasion he crowned with an honourable repentance, and a faithful martyrdom, his services to the English reformation. Pole succeeded him as archbishop

of Canterbury, but he and others of her counsellors opposed the queen's attempt to engage England in a war betwixt France and Spain, an object at which both Philip and Mary aimed. The queen, however, was able to raise an army of 10,000 men, which was sent to assist in a war which, in 1558, deprived the English of Calais.

In 1554, Mary had entertained an idea of soon having an heir, and the circumstance was intimated to foreign courts, and occasioned great joy. Her hopes, however, proved fallacious, and the supposed pregnancy is represented as having been the commencement of a dropsy. At last a combination of melancholy circumstances occurred. The country was discontented, Philip was alienated, and the loss of Calais preyed on the mind of Mary. "When I die," said she, "Calais will be found at my heart." After a course of gloom and peevishness, terminating a life, deformed by many direful acts, though, by an association monstrous if not rare, connected with the holy name of religion, she died on the 17th of November, 1558, the same day that her counsellor, Cardinal Pole, expired, in the sixth year of her reign, and forty-fourth of her age.

Sir Thomas Wyatt, the Younger.

DIED A. D. 1554.

SIR THOMAS WYATT, son of the poet, wit, and courtier of that name, at first distinguished himself by his adherence to Queen Mary's cause. Though allied in blood to the Dudleys, he had stood aloof from Northumberland's insurrection, and before the issue of that ill-planned struggle could be known, had proclaimed Mary at Maidstone.¹ The projected alliance with Mary to Philip of Spain first shook his allegiance; he had been employed in several embassies to Spain, and his knowledge of the principles of that court was such as to determine him against any such intimate alliance betwixt the two countries as was now projected. Preferring patriotism to loyalty, he chose to risk his royal mistress's favour rather than see the interests of his country trifled with to gratify a woman's passion. In the plan of revolt resolved on—in which, if not the author, he took the leading part—it was agreed that Wyatt should raise the standard of revolt in Kent; Sir Peter Carew was the leader in the west; and the duke of Suffolk undertook to raise the midland counties. The premature discovery of their designs disconcerted their plan of co-operation. Carew fled to France; and Suffolk made an unsuccessful attempt to excite his tenants in Warwickshire; but Sir Thomas having established his head-quarters at Rochester, was joined by a considerable number of Kentish men. The duke of Norfolk hastened to quell the rebels, but the London trained bands, under Brete, who composed a principal part of Norfolk's force, but were chiefly Protestants, and therefore not very hearty in the queen's cause, fell back from their post, or rather went over to Wyatt, in the very outset of the engagement, shouting aloud, "We are all Englishmen!" and Norfolk was left nearly alone to shift for him-

¹ Carts.

self. The court opened an ineffectual negotiation with Wyatt, now advancing upon London at the head of 15,000 men; and Elizabeth being suspected of encouraging the rebels, was ordered to repair instantly to London.

On the 2d of February, 1554, Wyatt appeared at Deptford, but instead of pushing on to London, imprudently halted a day there, thus affording Mary's partisans time to rally around her. Defeated in an attempt to force London bridge, he retired to Kingston, and crossing the river at that place without resistance, arrived at Hyde Park corner on the 7th. Gardiner now entreated the queen to throw herself into the tower; but she would not listen to the proposal, and employed herself in encouraging her troops to stand their ground against the approaching foe. At Charing-cross a fierce conflict ensued, in which Wyatt, rashly advancing too far at the head of a small party, was surrounded and made prisoner after a most heroic resistance. It was immediately given out that Wyatt had made a full discovery of his accomplices, and had named the princess Elizabeth amongst them. It was said that she had received from Wyatt the whole scheme of his plot in a bracelet which he had caused to be conveyed to her; and she was accordingly sent for in haste to Hampton court. Nearly a month appears to have been employed in endeavouring to get Wyatt to inculcate the princess, who was meanwhile detained in the tower as a state-prisoner. Elizabeth was loud and vehement in her protestations of ignorance, and solemnly denied that she ever had held correspondence with 'that traitor Wyatt.' But the 'traitor' was as little disposed to accuse the princess as her best friends could be; and when the attorney-general endeavoured to insinuate that Elizabeth had been induced to countenance the rebellion, Wyatt indignantly denied the imputation. Nor did Mary's agents succeed more to their wishes with any of the minor conspirators, none of whom could, by any threats or promises, be made to criminate the princess. This brave youth was beheaded on the 11th of April, and spent his last breath in asserting Elizabeth's innocence of any participation in his plans.

John Russell, Earl of Bedford.

DIED A. D. 1555.

JOHN RUSSELL, first earl of Bedford, was the eldest son of James Russell of Kingston in the county of Dorset, an estate which had been for nearly four centuries in the family. Having been accidentally introduced to Philip, archduke of Austria, at the house of Sir Thomas Trenchard, that prince was so much pleased with his manners and appearance, that he took him to Windsor in his retinue and recommended him strongly to Henry VII., who appointed him one of the gentlemen of his privy chamber. It has been doubted, however, how far the Spaniard's visit to Henry on this occasion was an act of spontaneous courtesy. He had been shipwrecked at Weymouth, and though hospitably entertained at the mansion of Sir Thomas Trenchard, may have been regarded by his host as a prisoner rather than a guest. In conformity with this view of the matter, Russell has been represented as

having accompanied the archduke to court in the capacity of a sentinel, placed over him to observe his motions and preclude the possibility of his making his escape. Whether or not this latter view be correct, it is certain that young Russell owed his first introduction at court to the circumstance of the archduke's appearance there, and that he soon became a favourite and honoured courtier.

On the accession of Henry VIII., Russell was honoured with an increased share of royal patronage. His polished manners, his graceful appearance, his acquaintance with foreign languages, and various other advantages which he had gained during some years of foreign travel, all conspired to recommend him to the good graces of a monarch fond of show and gallantry. In 1513, he accompanied the king to France, and during the siege of Theroüenne, performed an act of singular bravery, having at the head of only 250 men retaken a piece of ordnance from a large body of the enemy. Soon after this exploit, he succeeded in cutting off a large supply of provisions which the French were endeavouring to introduce into the town. On this occasion Henry advanced to meet him on his return towards the camp, and the following dialogue took place: "So," cried the king, "while we are fooling, the town is relieved!" "So it is, indeed," answered Russell, "for I have sent them two thousand carcasses, and they have spared us twelve hundred waggons of provisions." "But I sent after you," replied the king, "to cut off the bridge." "That" rejoined Russell, "was the first thing I did, wherefore I am upon my knees for your majesty's grace and pardon." "Nay then," exclaimed Henry, "by our lady thou hast not my pardon only, but my favour too!" In 1522, Russell accompanied the naval expedition commanded by the earl of Surrey against France, and was knighted by that nobleman for his good service at the sacking of Morlaix. In 1523, he was sent on an embassy to Rome, whence he proceeded to the court of the duke of Bourbon, whom he prevailed on to join the alliance between Henry and the emperor. In 1525, he fought in the battle of Pavia.

In March 1538, he was created Baron Russell of Cheney in the county of Buckingham, an estate which he had acquired by his wife. He had already been appointed comptroller of the household, and member of the privy council. On the dissolution of the greater monasteries, his royal master heaped wealth upon him with a most bountiful hand: among other grants, he obtained the entire demesne of the rich abbey of Tavistock, comprising nearly thirty manors, with other large estates in Devon, Bucks, and Somerset. In 1541, he was constituted lord-admiral of England and Ireland; and in 1543, the custody of the privy seal was committed to him.

At the coronation of Edward VI., he executed the office of lord-high-steward of England, and soon after received a grant of the dissolved monastery of Woburn in Bedfordshire, which has been the chief residence of the Bedford family ever since. His services against the insurgents in the western counties, in 1549, procured for him the title of earl of Bedford, and removed him from the still more dangerous scene of intrigue then getting up against the protector. He did not long survive the accession of Mary. His last public service was to escort Philip of Spain from Corunna to London, and introduce him to that princess. He died on the 14th of March, 1555. His character, if not

remarkable for great qualities, remains free from the charge of great crimes. A Burke once sought to wound an earl of Bedford through the founder of his family, but the censure was made in general terms, and amounted to little more than the insinuation that the first earl of Bedford may not have deserved all the favours which successive sovereigns were pleased to heap upon him.

Sir Thomas Pope.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1508.—DIED A. D. 1559.

SIR THOMAS POPE, the founder of Trinity college, Oxford, was born at Deddington, in Oxfordshire, about the year 1508. He was educated at Banbury school, and subsequently at Eton college. Having adopted the profession of the law, he studied at Gray's inn, and, in October, 1533, received the appointment of clerk of the briefs in the star-chamber. Two years after, he was constituted warden of the mint; and, in October, 1536, he received the honour of knighthood at the same time with Henry Howard. In 1539, on the first establishment of the court of augmentations, Sir Thomas received the lucrative office of its treasurership. The business of this court was to make up valuations of the lands belonging to the dissolved monasteries, to collect their revenues, and generally to apply the possessions of dissolved religious establishments to the use and behoof of the crown. The treasurer's office was a post of considerable profit and dignity, and the person holding it ranked with the principal officers of state.

Sir Thomas held this last office for five years, and, on the formation of a new court of augmentation in 1546, he was nominated master of the crown forests on this side the Trent, and a member of the privy council. These successive appointments, especially those connected with the augmentation courts, brought in an immense revenue to Sir Thomas, and, in 1556, we find him possessed of no fewer than thirty manors, besides other estates and advowsons. During the reign of Henry VIII. Sir Thomas continued high in favour at court; but on the accession of Edward VI., his religious principles militated against him, and he received neither favour nor office. The succession of Mary again opened up the road of preferment and honour to him, and he was appointed a privy councillor and cofferer to the royal household. During this reign we find his name associated with that of Bonner and others, in a commission for the more effectual suppression of heretics; yet his behaviour towards the princess Elizabeth, who was placed under his care in 1555, was highly courteous and creditable to his feelings as a man of honour and integrity. He died shortly after Elizabeth's accession to the throne, in January, 1559, and was interred in the parish church of St Stephen's, Walbrook, where his second wife, Margaret, had been buried; but, in 1567, their bodies were removed to the chapel of Trinity college.

It was at a period when the rage for polemic disputation had almost expelled the study of classic literature from the schools, that Sir Thomas founded Trinity college in Oxford, and made it a particular regulation, that its inmates should acquire "a just relish for the graces

and purity of the Latin tongue." The authors enjoined to be read with this view, were Cicero, Quintilian, Aulus Gellius, Plautus, Terence, Virgil, Horace, Livy, and Lucan. Cardinal Pole, at the request of the founder, revised the statutes of the new foundation.

Cardinal Pole.

BORN A. D. 1500.—DIED A. D. 1558.

THIS eminent ecclesiastical politician was born at Stoverton castle, Lancashire, in 1500. He was son of Sir Richard Pole, by the countess of Salisbury, who was daughter of the duke of Clarence, brother of Edward IV. He had for instructors those two celebrated men, William Latimer and Thomas Linacre, the former of whom was indebted to his pupil's influence for ecclesiastical preferment. After studying at Sheen, Pole was entered at Magdalene college, Oxford. In 1517, he became prebendary of Roscomb, in the church of Salisbury, and, about two years after, was promoted to the deanery of Exeter. In 1519, he set out for Italy, furnished for his travels by his relative, Henry VIII., who also afforded him an annual pension. After visiting several foreign universities, he took up his residence at Padua. Thence he proceeded to Venice and other parts of Italy. In 1525, he went to Rome, where he wished to witness the celebration of the jubilee, and, the same year, returned, by Florence, to England. Here he was well received, but, leaving court, retired to a Carthusian convent at Sheen, in Surrey.

In 1529, Pole obtained permission again to go abroad. By means of him, during his stay on the continent, Henry sought to obtain the assent of the university of Paris to the invalidity of his marriage with Catharine of Arragon. Pole declined the office; but, in the course of a short time, again took up his residence at Sheen. His assent being desired to the question respecting the validity of the royal marriage being determined without reference to the papal court, and, it is said, the archbishopric of York being held out to him as an inducement, he went to confer with Henry on the subject, but, instead of assenting, as he had intended to do, expressed an opposite opinion. His conduct, in this matter gave offence to the king, but he was again permitted to go abroad, and even continued to receive his pension. Leaving England, he proceeded to Avignon, and afterwards to Padua, from which he occasionally went to Venice. At last, he expressed himself decidedly against the king's divorce from Catharine, and also against Henry's ecclesiastical supremacy, in a work on 'Church Unity,' which was printed in 1536. In this book he compares Henry to Nebuchadnezzar, and calls on the emperor, Charles V. to avenge the cause of Catharine and the Romish church. "The book," says Bishop Burnet,¹ "was more considered for the author, and the wit and eloquence of it, than for any great learning or deep reasoning in it. The indecencies of the expressions against the king, not to mention the scurrilous language he bestows on Sampson, whose book he undertook to answer, are such, that

¹ History of the Reformation, book iii.

it appears how much the Italian air had changed him, and that his converse at Padua had for some time defaced that generous temper of mind which was otherwise so natural to him." The king, however, did not at once proceed to extremities against him, but asked him to come over to England and explain certain parts of his treatise. Pole, however, continued his residence abroad, where he seems to have gained great distinction as a literary man, and was deprived of his ecclesiastical offices at home.

But the way to ruin in England was, in Italy, the course to dignity and power. Pole was summoned by the pope to attend a general council for the reformation of ecclesiastical abuses. He reached that city in 1536. His holiness offered to make him a cardinal. This honour he declined; but at length he was prevailed upon; and, having received the clerical tonsure, was created cardinal of St Nereus and Achilleus. The pope also appointed him nuncio to France and Flanders. At Paris he did not continue long. On hearing that Henry had solicited the king of France to give him up, he went to Cambray, from whence he removed to Liege, and was thence recalled to Rome. About this period of his life he seems to have been busily engaged in treasonable intercourse with England, and it has been supposed to have been with a view to exciting a rebellion there, that the pope sent him again to France and Flanders in 1538. In that year, a correspondence of the cardinal with his two brothers, Lord Montacute and Sir Geoffrey de la Pole, besides some other English gentlemen, was discovered, and brought several individuals to execution. His mother, the countess of Salisbury, was soon to follow. One of the accusations against her, was a correspondence with her son, the cardinal; and, in May, 1539, this aged lady perished on the scaffold.

In the year 1545, the pope summoned a council to the town of Trent. To this Pole and two other cardinals were sent, as legates from his holiness. On this occasion, Pole wrote a book on councils, and proceeded to Trent, attended by an escort, it being apprehended that emissaries from the English king awaited him on the road. At length, however, in 1547, Henry died. On young Edward's accession, the cardinal sent an apology for himself, and recommended a reconciliation of England to the pope. In 1549, on the death of his holiness, he himself was elected to the papal chair. He declined, however, to accept, alleging that the election had been precipitately and unseasonably made. Whether his refusal arose from an unmingled sense of honour and propriety, or whether it was not rather influenced by an anticipation of attaining to the English throne, by means of a marriage with the princess Mary, it might be useless to inquire. By permission of the new pope, Julius III., he retired to a monastery at Maguzano, where he remained until the death of Edward VI.

At length, on the accession of the princess Mary to the English throne, the pope appointed the cardinal legate to his native country. It has been said that the new queen was educated along with Pole, under his mother, the countess of Salisbury, and even that an early attachment subsisted between the two. However this may be, a proposal seems to have been made about the time of her accession, that she should marry him; and to a jealousy on this subject the conduct of the emperor, Charles V., in detaining the legate in his dominions after

the latter had set out on his embassy to England, has been attributed. Negotiations had previously taken place, for Mary's marriage with Philip, the emperor's son. It is possible, however, that, as a late excellent historian remarks,² Charles "feared the opposition of Pole to the Spanish match, not only as an Englishman, but as jealous of Spanish greatness, and unwilling that his influence over Mary should be shared with a husband of commanding character." On November 20th, 1554, the cardinal arrived at Dover. He found the act of attainder against him repealed, was received by the king and queen at Whitehall, and proceeded to Lambeth, where the palace had been fitted up for his use. On the 27th, he proposed to parliament, that they should enter into a reconciliation with the pope. For this both houses applied. Their petition was presented to the king and queen. They, in their turn, interceded with the legate, who accordingly granted absolution. After this ceremony, the *Te Deum* was sung. Two days thereafter, Pole went publicly through London, but was not well received by the citizens.

Previously to the cardinal's arrival in England, he and the emperor had disagreed in the counsel which they gave respecting the restoration of the Roman Catholic religion. Charles recommended the change to be gradually made, while Pole, like "a true son of the church," advised the immediate re-establishment of the old institution. Nor can it be said that the legate, after his arrival, was by any means utterly free from severity in carrying out his views. He issued commissions for the prosecution of heretics, towards whom he testified an orthodox displeasure. His opposition seems to have extended to public documents as well as living heretics. The following somewhat curious proclamation is recorded in Bishop Burnet's preface to the History of the Reformation:—"Whereas it has come to our knowledge that, in the time of the late schism, divers compts, books, scrolls, and instruments, and other writs, were practised, devised, and made, concerning professions against the pope's holiness, and the see apostolic; and also sundry informal scrutinies taken in abbeys and other religious houses, tending rather to subvert and overthrow all good religion and religious houses than for any truth contained therein: which being in the custody of divers registers, and we intending to have those writings brought to knowledge, whereby they may be considered and ordered according to our will and pleasure," &c. Bonner, Cole, dean of St Paul's, and Dr Martine, or any two of them, are accordingly "empowered to cite any persons before them, and examine them upon the premises upon oath, and to bring all such writings before them, and certify their diligence about it to Cardinal Pool, that further order may be given about them." Zealous, however, as Pole was in favour of his church, he and Bishop Gardiner seem to have differed in regard to toleration,—the latter encouraging high principles of persecution for heresy,—the former, who seems to have been naturally benevolent and mild, advising less severity.

But persecution proved the means of the cardinal's promotion: for on the execution of Cranmer, in 1556, Pole succeeded him as archbishop of Canterbury. Mary gave another expression of regard for

² Sir J. Mackintosh, *Hist. of England*, vol. ii. p. 298.

the cardinal, when, in 1557, Paul IV., who had a prejudice against him, withdrew his authority as legate, and appointed Cardinal Peyto in his room. Her majesty interfered in the matter, and, ultimately, Pole was reinstated in the office. Yet he did not uniformly support the measures of the queen. When, shortly before the end of her life, she sought the prosecution of war between France and Spain, he set himself against the scheme.

Both were soon to leave the political scene on which they had acted so prominent a part. The queen expired, November 17th, 1558, and the cardinal, who had long been sickly, on the same day or that immediately succeeding. His body lay in state at Lambeth, and was thence conveyed to Canterbury. On his monument was inscribed this short and simple epitaph :—*Depositum Cardinalis Poli.*

Elizabeth.

BORN A. D. 1533.—DIED A. D. 1603.

THIS celebrated princess was daughter of Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn, his queen, and was born at the palace of Greenwich, 7th September, 1533. The infant was created princess of Wales, and her baptism was attended by a host of noble personages : Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, at the request of the king, standing godfather to the child. In 1535, Henry negotiated with the king of France respecting a marriage between young Elizabeth and the duke of Angouleme, the third son of that monarch ; but the pope declined to rescind his predecessor's sentence against Henry for his divorce with Catharine, and the matrimonial scheme was frustrated. By the execution of Anne, in the following year, Elizabeth was deprived of her mother. The loss, however, she was too young perhaps adequately to understand, nor, probably, was Anne—whether innocent or not of the charge which brought her to the scaffold—particularly fitted to advance the improvement of her child. The wants of the daughter seem to have been neglected amidst the greater misfortunes of the mother, and Elizabeth's governess, Lady Bryan, in a letter supposed to have been written soon after the death of the latter, asks of Cromwell, Henry's minister, a supply of clothing for her royal charge. But this little domestic misfortune was not the limit of Elizabeth's early losses. In the parliament which met a few weeks after her mother's death, she, as well as her sister Mary, was pronounced illegitimate, and her right of succession to the throne annulled. This privilege, however, was restored by act of parliament in 1544, and, on the death of James V. of Scotland, the king, according to the manner of the time, and of the English court when under the wayward rule of Henry, who, if, in his own case, he accommodated politics to wedlock, seems, in that of his children, to have made marriage subservient to the safety of his throne and the aggrandisement of his kingdom—besides offering his young son, Edward, in marriage to James's infant daughter, Mary, had proposed Elizabeth to the earl of Arran, regent of Scotland, for himself or for his son, it seems uncertain which. In 1546, however, proposals were made for a union betwixt her and Philip of Spain, who was afterwards married to

her elder sister, Mary. Meanwhile, under the care of William Grindal, and then of the celebrated Roger Ascham, the princess had been proceeding in her literary studies; and, in 1550, the latter, in an epistle to Sturmius, describes her, at the age of sixteen, as of solid intellect, courteous manners, retentive memory, and warm attachment to religion and learning,—as excelling in French, Italian, music, and penmanship,—and as having read with him most of Cicero, and a large portion of Livy, as well as plays of Sophocles, speeches of Isocrates, and the Greek New Testament.¹

The death of Edward VI., in July, 1553, deprived Elizabeth of a brother possessed of literary attainments and religious principles kindred to her own, by whose mother she seems to have been kindly treated, and betwixt whom and Elizabeth there subsisted a mutual attachment. Edward, however, was induced, before his death, to settle the succession to the throne on his cousin, Lady Jane Grey. On his demise, accordingly, Lady Jane was proclaimed, and messengers from the earl of Northumberland, the prominent agent in that fatal step, sought to induce Elizabeth to resign her claim. She replied, that the first person to be settled with on the subject was Mary; and, having put herself at the head of a thousand horse, she proceeded to meet her sister on her way to London, and accompanied her on her public entry into the metropolis. But, in her connection with Mary's court, Elizabeth's lot was to prove unfortunate: owing, it appears, in part at least, to a preference shown by Courtney—whom the queen, on her accession, released from imprisonment, and towards whom she seems to have felt a tender attachment—for the younger princess. The marriage of Henry VIII. and Catharine of Arragon, the mother of the queen, having been confirmed as valid by the parliament which met at the beginning of Mary's reign, the daughter of Anne Boleyn ranked, at court, after the countess of Lennox and the duchess of Suffolk, and she soon retired from the scene of her degradation to Ashridge, in Buckinghamshire, where Sir Thomas Pope and Sir John Gage were appointed to attend her. But, on occasion of Wyatt's insurrection at the beginning of 1554, Mary recalled her to court, under pretext of care for Elizabeth's safety. This summons the sickness of the latter, feigned or real, withheld her from obeying. But, a report arising of the princess being an accomplice of Wyatt, in his rebellious attempt, a deputation from court hurried her away from Ashridge. She was borne on a litter, and on the way received public expressions of regard. After being examined by the privy-council, before whom she declared herself innocent, she returned to her country residence. The report of her connection with the rebellion, however, was renewed, and, although she wrote the queen a letter on the subject, and continued to declare her innocence, she was committed to the tower. On going out of the barge which bore her to the place of her confinement, she said, "Here landeth as true a subject, being a prisoner, as ever landed at these stairs; and before thee, O God! I speak it, having no other friends but thee alone." Wyatt, at his execution, pronounced her innocent of concern in his attempt; and, after having been kept in close confinement for a month, she was

¹ Ascham has remarked the circumstance of Elizabeth having been educated according to his favourite method of *Double Translations*.

conveyed at last from the tower to the palace of Richmond. She had been intrusted to the care of Sir Henry Beddingfield. His behaviour was rough, and the princess—who seems to have been greatly moved by her present circumstances—was still treated as a prisoner. Mary offered her deliverance if she would agree to marry the duke of Savoy—a proposal which Elizabeth declined. She was now conveyed to Oxfordshire, and, on the third day, after receiving expressions of popular regard on the journey, reached Ricot, the residence of Lord Williams. Here she was hospitably received; but she was soon removed to Woodstock, where Beddingfield continued to attend her. Early, however, in 1555, Elizabeth, who had gained the personal or political favour of Philip, now the husband of the queen, came, attended by Beddingfield, to Hampton-court. Bishop Gardiner advised her to make submission to Mary; but she rejected the proposal, declaring that she appealed to the laws of the country, not to the clemency of the queen. At an interview, however, between the royal sisters, Mary put a ring on the finger of Elizabeth, and it has been said that the latter requested the queen to give her some treatises to peruse in favour of the Roman Catholic faith. Whether or not she entered at this time on the study of the questions at issue between the two churches, it appears that, this year, attended by her former tutor, Roger Ascham, she occupied herself with classical pursuits.

Sir Thomas Pope, to whom the princess was intrusted about this time, was a mild and indulgent man. With him, as her superintendent, she resided at different houses in succession, and finally settled at Hatfield, Herts. Part of his duty was to take care that mass was performed in Elizabeth's establishment; and it appears that, in September, 1555, she joined Mary and the court, in preparing, by a fast, for a public act of forgiveness on the part of the pope. Mary even wrote to her sister in terms of kindness, and declined, notwithstanding the desire of Philip, who was now abroad, to enforce on her a marriage with the duke of Savoy. In the spring of 1557, the queen visited Elizabeth at Hatfield; in the summer of the same year, the latter paid her royal sister a visit, which was accompanied with much magnificence, at Richmond; and when, about this time, Elizabeth refused proposals to marry Eric, son of the king of Sweden, Mary expressed satisfaction at her conduct.

On the 17th of November, 1558, the queen died, and Elizabeth was called to the English throne. On hearing of her accession, she fell upon her knees, and uttered these words from the book of Psalms: "*A Domino factum est illud, et est mirabile oculis nostris.*" On the 20th, she held a privy-council at Hatfield, and chose Sir William Cecil as her principal secretary, Sir Thomas Parry comptroller of the household, and Sir Edward Rogers captain of the guard.² Parry had long been her cofferer, and Cecil, afterwards Lord Burleigh—a name so eminent in the history of her reign—had corresponded with her in the course of her misfortunes. On the 23d, she proceeded towards London, and from the Charterhouse, where she fixed her residence, went on horseback, amidst the shouts of her subjects, to the Tower, where she fell on her knees, and rendered thanks to the Almighty, and

² Camden.

whither, in procession from the palace of Westminster, she again went, on the 12th of January, 1559. Two days thereafter, she proceeded, with a large attendance, through London, seated in a chariot; and, next day—although the prelates had refused to perform the service of the coronation for the heretical princess—that ceremony was performed by the bishop of Carlisle. She was welcomed in the city with great public preparations; and, though popular joy is no infallible sign of cordial attachment to the individual in whose cause it is excited, there was much in Elizabeth's character that may have inspired hopes of an effectual revival of England from the melancholy condition into which, under her predecessor, it had sunk.

With Sir William Cecil, who was a decided supporter of the reformed religion, the queen took counsel on the subject, at the beginning of her reign. Before her coronation, she gave directions for a great part of the church-service to be read in English, and also prohibited, in her own chapel—to the practice of which the churches had been ordered to conform—the elevation of the host. In the course of her procession through the city, when an English Bible was presented to her, she pressed it to her lips and bosom, and for that present returned the city especial thanks. Her future conduct, as sovereign, corresponded to these early expressions of her favour for the Protestant religion; but—as is little wonderful, considering her parentage and early life—certain preferences for particular Roman Catholic observances appear to have clung to this patroness of the English reformation. She disliked the marriage of priests and the free exercise of preaching, and was fond of altars, crucifixes, and clerical vestments. From early prejudice, perhaps, or from a wish to avoid unnecessary opposition to the Roman Catholic party in the state, notwithstanding the generally favourable disposition of the nation towards a revival of the Protestant articles and worship, when, on the day after the coronation, several courtiers besought that, besides the other prisoners released in honour of the new reign, the four evangelists and St Paul might also be freed from their captivity, she gravely answered that they should be consulted in the first place whether or not they were willing so to be released.

Parliament, which met in this same month, confirmed the right of Elizabeth to the crown, and, by a deputation from the house of commons, she was advised to marry. She replied, that she had formerly resisted, on that subject, the temptations both of ambition and of danger, and that she still preferred a single to a married life; that, as the recommendation was general, and did not suggest any particular person for her husband, she was not offended at the interference; but that for the commons to have proposed a person for her to make choice of, would have been unbefitting *their* character as subjects, and *her's* as an independent queen; that England was her husband, and the people were her children.³ This last idea, indeed, seems to have been a favourite one with Elizabeth—for she is said to have frequently remarked, that she would not believe respecting her subjects, what parents would not credit respecting their children. But if she felt the attachment, she also exercised the discipline of the parental character, and on this occasion she evinced that combination of regard to her own pre-

³Journal of Commons, 54.

rogative and rights, and gracious expressions towards her subjects, which she displayed in the future period of her reign. As to her former resistance to entering on the married state, it can scarcely be said to have been without reason that she spoke of it as she did. She had declined the hand of the duke of Savoy, and afterwards of Philip II., and Eric, king of Sweden. In the same year she entered on one of those 'progresses' which she occasionally made, and which gave her an opportunity both of receiving entertainment from her nobles, and of affording a gracious reception to her poorer subjects. If the representation given on this subject by Bohun, one of her eulogists, be correct, the parental character which she claimed was in some measure realized by the sweetness and condescension of her manners, even though it be granted that political prudence was one of the motives which prompted her gracious behaviour towards her poor petitioners.

This year, 1559, Elizabeth sent assistance to the Protestants in Scotland, and afterwards she refused a passport of safety to her cousin Mary, queen of Scots, on the return of that princess to Scotland, from her residence in France. There Mary, it seems, had assumed the English arms, so as to excite the jealousy of the English queen; and she had also been under the training of her uncle, the duke of Guise. Against the party headed by this Catholic house, Elizabeth supported the Protestant followers of Conde. But, jealous as she appears to have been of the Roman Catholics abroad, she declined, when the parliament, which met in 1563, recommended her entering into marriage, so as to fix the succession to the throne, to give a promise to that effect, or to decide in favour either of the supporters of Mary, queen of Scots, or of the family of Suffolk—the two rival aspirants at the succession to the English crown. For her cousin, the queen of Scots, however, she seemed to entertain a friendly regard, and proposed to her the hand of her own favourite, Robert Dudley; but, on Mary showing a disposition to entertain the proposal, she discouraged further proceedings towards its consummation.⁴ On this occasion, Mary sent Sir Robert Melville to confer with the English queen, and that envoy has recorded, in his 'Memoirs' some amusing particulars of his visit to her court. He and Elizabeth conversed respecting the garbs of different countries, and the latter having appeared in a variety of dresses, she asked Melville which of them best became her. He replied, the Italian, thinking he should thereby gratify her, as, in that dress, her hair, of which she seemed to have a high idea, was peculiarly displayed. She even asked him, whether he thought Mary or herself the fairer? He replied, that he thought Elizabeth the fairest person in England, and Mary the fairest in Scotland. Which of the two was the taller? was another of her queenly inquiries; and, on his answering, Mary, she suggested that, in that case, her cousin was too tall, as she herself was of proper stature. The same style of question she extended to music and dancing. This picture is certainly by no means flattering to the modesty and dignity of the English queen. In articles of dress, Elizabeth, learned and powerful as she was, seems to have taken a peculiar pride, if we may judge from the magnificence and multitude of those which she possessed, although, indeed, Ascham represents her as, in youth, eminent for free-

⁴ Keith 241—252.

dom from gaiety in dress; nor is it a fact without an amusing sort of interest, and even perhaps great moral weight, as illustrating the weakness and inconsistency of human character, that a proclamation was issued against incorrect likenesses of her majesty, about the very time when we find her retiring from the seat of the plague to the perusal of the fathers of the church.

In 1566, Sir James Melville repeated his visit to the English court, in order to announce the birth of Mary's son, Prince James, afterwards Elizabeth's successor. The queen, who had given a ball at Greenwich on the evening of the Scottish envoy's arrival, when she heard of the joyful event, treated it rather as a gloomy one, leaning her head on her arms, and bewailing the want in her own case of the good fortune which had happened to the queen of Scots. In September thereafter parliament met. Cecil announced that Elizabeth had an intention to marry; but while they were proceeding in a debate respecting the succession, a message from the queen arrived forbidding them to go on. The command drew from one of the members an inquiry as to its legality, and others expressed dissatisfaction with the conduct of the queen in regard to the succession. She repeated her prohibition, but at last allowed the house to proceed. Yet, in closing the parliament, 2d January, 1567, she represented certain of the members as seemingly against her, professing, however, a wish to fix the succession. "Whether I live," said her majesty, "to see the like assembly or no, or whoever holds the reins of government, let me warn you to beware of provoking your sovereign's patience, so far as you have done mine."⁵

But if Elizabeth's circumstances were at this moment somewhat different from what so great a lover of prerogative desired, she was soon called to contemplate the darker lot of the queen of Scots. On the death of Darnley, Mary's husband, in February, 1567, Elizabeth wrote to her, with a view to secure for Lennox, the father of the deceased, an addition to the time allowed him for preparing evidence of Bothwell's concern in Darnley's death; and after the marriage of the Scottish queen with that suspected man, and her subsequent confinement in the castle of Lochleven, she expressed both pity for Mary's misfortunes and displeasure at her conduct—advising her to avoid revenge against her enemies, to punish the murderers of Darnley, and to send her son to be educated in England. She also expressed an intention to support her cause, and authorised her envoy Throckmorton, to caution the associated lords against rebellion. He was also directed not to take a part in the coronation of Prince James—a ceremony which was performed, 29th July, 1567, after Mary had signed her abdication at the place of her confinement; the French government was counselled to stop commercial intercourse with Scotland, until Mary should be restored; and when the queen of Scots escaped from Lochleven, Elizabeth offered her assistance. On the 16th of May, 1568, Mary, on the defeat of her supporters at the battle of Langside, crossed to the English shore.⁶ Lord Scrope, and Sir Francis Knollys, met her at the castle of Carlisle, and conveyed to her Elizabeth's condolences, but intimated that, under the present suspicions of her conduct, she could not be admitted to the presence of the English queen. The earl of Murray,

⁵ D'Ewes 117.—Camden, 127.

⁶ Keith, 477.

now head of the Scottish reformation, and Mary herself agreed to refer the dispute between them to Elizabeth. Mary drew back; but Elizabeth expostulated, and at last the commissioners of Mary met with those of the English queen. Mary declined to answer, alleging that her sovereign rank withheld her from being amenable to any tribunal. Elizabeth wrote her, and suggested to her commissioners that it would be an evidence of guilt, if, after the charges made against her, she failed to offer a defence. A personal interview with Mary, Elizabeth still refused, yet declined to acknowledge that there was a lawful king or regency in Scotland. Neither would she agree to Mary's proposal to go over to her friends in France. In 1569, she discovered a scheme of the duke of Norfolk to marry her royal prisoner, and committed him to the tower, from which, however, he was soon released, and received again into favour, on his engaging to give up the scheme of the marriage, but by this time, an insurrection had occurred, headed by the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, of which Mary herself had gained information from the leaders. Elizabeth sent an army into Scotland on the charge of the English rebels having received protection in that country, but to Mary she continued to make friendly professions, although similar terms appear to have been allotted to the opposite party. Norfolk failed to fulfil his engagement, and a new attempt, fostered by Rodolphi, the bishop of Ross, and perhaps the queen of Scots herself, brought him to the scaffold on the 2d of June, 1572. Elizabeth twice revoked her signature to the warrant for his death, but, at length, acceded to a petition from parliament, that she would authorize his execution. To Mary she sent messengers asking satisfaction for her late conduct in the affair of Norfolk. Mary partly denied, and partly excused her participation in the matter. The parliament were incensed against the Scottish queen, but Elizabeth sent orders that they should not proceed in their opposition. Yet to these transactions excited by the partisans of Mary, Elizabeth could not be indifferent, and a sonnet on the disorders of the time, attributed to Elizabeth, was published, in her own life-time, by Puttenham, in his 'Art of Poetry.'

In August, 1574, was perpetrated in France, under Charles IX., that infamous massacre of Protestants, by which upwards of twenty thousand persons were destroyed. On this occasion, a French ambassador, Fenelon, appeared at the English court, to explain the conduct of the king of France in this horrible transaction. He was received by the courtiers with solemn and melancholy silence, and Elizabeth herself, though she heard his explanation with apparent calmness, declared that she considered the deed a guilty one, even though the allegation of the French government were true, that the Hugonots had engaged in a conspiracy. But, in politics, prudence may seem to dictate what honour would otherwise forbid; and, in the present case, Elizabeth went farther towards preserving an alliance with the French court—which was countenanced in its recent act by the pope and even by the Spanish government—than, even with the temptations to moderate conduct which her situation presented, the generous hatred of injustice and perfidy may be willing to excuse. Although, indeed, she renewed her protestation against the massacre, she allowed a marriage to be negotiated between herself and the duke of Alençon, the third brother of the French king, and sent the earl of Worcester to assist at the baptism of

a child of Charles. Some time after, the duke of Alençon, now become duke of Anjou, visited Elizabeth at Greenwich, but the conference was secret. Burleigh, and some others, however, were authorised to enter into terms on the subject with the French ambassadors, and it was agreed that, in six weeks after the ratification, the royal parties should be married. But, after her usual manner, she vacillated on the subject.⁷ She seems, however, to have had a decided inclination towards the marriage, and, when the duke visited her, in November, 1581, she is said to have put on his hand a ring taken from her own. But her most approved counsellors were against the match,—the accomplished Sir Philip Sidney sought by a letter to dissuade her,—and at last, after much doubt and anxiety, the scheme was given up. A puritan, of the name of Stubbs, however, who had published a book against the marriage, was condemned to lose his hand—a sentence at the execution of which he exclaimed, “God save the queen!”

Meanwhile the queen of Scots was kept in strict captivity, and no doubt the prudent mind of Elizabeth might see some reason, in the foreign alliances and Romish faith of Mary, to be jealous of her return to power. The English queen, however, took some steps to have Mary associated with James in the government of Scotland. In 1584, she was still exposed to peril, and an association of her subjects bound themselves to her defence,—a measure also adopted, about the same time, by parliament, which, in that season of danger, enacted a law—executed on future occasions, even to the death of the accused—against Jesuits and popish priests. Parliamentary interference in the internal affairs of the church, however, Elizabeth prohibited. At this time she objected to the commons for taking such a step, and, at the close of the session, this ‘governess of the church’ levelled her arrows not only against Catholics, but against Puritans also—a party that sought for greater exemption than the church of England afforded from the character of the church of Rome, and to which the queen had a particular dislike. With James she at length entered into an alliance, and the discovery of a conspiracy carried on by authority of Babington, which aimed at the assassination of Elizabeth, brought to the scaffold first fourteen of the conspirators, and then the queen of Scots herself. Mary denied that she had concurred in the plan of murdering the English queen; but the evidence of her two secretaries, Nare and Curle were adduced against her, and—whether or not with sufficient reason, it may be difficult to decide—sentence of death was pronounced on Mary, whose ardent temper and long captivity were but too much calculated to involve her in dangerous attempts. Elizabeth professed great unwillingness to execute the sentence. She summoned a parliament, and by that the sentence was confirmed. She still expressed herself as unwilling to enforce it, and even on the parliament strongly renewing its former recommendation, she dismissed the commissioners without a definite reply. According to the will of parliament, however, she issued a proclamation of the sentence. This was met by popular assent. But though the sentence was thus supported at home, foreign powers besought Elizabeth not to execute it. James also interfered in behalf of his mother. The queen replied as if it were her purpose to assent to Mary’s execu-

⁷ Camden 265.

tion, and her ministers advised her to the measure. At last she seemed to be alarmed by reports—artfully or honestly raised—of danger from abroad, and directed her secretary, Davison, to prepare a warrant for the execution of the queen of Scots—professing, however, that she meant to keep it beside her, to be ready in case of an attempt to release her royal prisoner. The warrant was prepared, and she signed it, and directed it to be communicated to the chancellor in order to be sealed. She then desired that it might be kept for some time, before being so disposed of. The order was too late—the warrant had passed the great seal. On Davison telling the queen so, she blamed him for precipitation. He consulted her council on the subject: they advised him to send the warrant to be executed, pledging his safety should he do so. Davison complied, and, on the 8th of February, 1587, the beautiful queen of Scots closed, by a violent death, a long captivity.⁸ Elizabeth on hearing of Mary's execution, professed to be surprised,—her countenance changed,—for a considerable time she continued speechless,—and at last she broke out in mournful wailings. She put on deep mourning, and expressed great displeasure at any of her counsellors who approached her, accusing them of an unpardonable offence.⁹ To James she wrote an apology, professing hatred of dissimulation, and declaring that she had not assented to his mother's death,—that, in fact, she could not write of it, and left it to a relative of her own to explain the matter to the king; and that she had intended not to execute against Mary the righteous sentence pronounced against her. Davison was imprisoned and fined. His relation of the circumstances, however, bears witness to Elizabeth having expressed an intention to authorize the execution of the sentence, but, at the same time, to a wish, on her part, to throw the execution of it from herself upon others; and he remarks, that, after the death of Norfolk, she had cast blame on Lord Burleigh in like manner as, in this case, she did on himself. Upon the whole, there is too much reason to suppose that Elizabeth's conduct, on occasion of Mary's death, partook of hypocrisy; although, indeed, it seems but reasonable to admit that, as a relative of Mary, as having long detained her in a state of confinement, which seems to have prompted her to the attempts which she made against the English queen, and, as a princess jealous of royal prerogative, she may, before she signed the warrant, have been sincerely scrupulous, and, after it was executed, painfully excited.

In the course of these proceedings, at home, against the queen of Scots, Elizabeth had been opposing abroad the Spanish power. In the defence of the Dutch against the authority of that court, she had assigned a chief command to her favourite, Dudley, earl of Leicester, and, at the battle of Zutphen, she had lost a knight of more honourable fame, the illustrious Sir Philip Sydney—that 'jewel of her times,' as she called him. Towards Leicester, however, she had shown great dissatisfaction, for accepting of certain exalted honours paid him by the United Provinces; and that unworthy favourite, having now incurred odium abroad, was, in 1587, recalled from his command, though not finally rejected from the favour of the queen. Next year was distinguished by the discomfiture of the 'Invincible armada'—that celebrated

⁸ Robertson.—Camden.

⁹ Strype.

fleet sent forth by Philip of Spain, for the invasion of England. It was an occasion fitted to excite the energies of a Protestant queen. The invasion was supported by a papal bull against the heretical land and sovereign of England. On the result of it the Protestants rested their hopes respecting the national religion, and the future destiny of England was at stake. The queen was energetic and active in her preparations for the approaching crisis. She appeared in person in the camp at Tilbury, on horseback, and exhorted the soldiers, declaring that she herself would lead them to the field. On the 19th of July, the armada—which is described as a magnificent spectacle—arrived in the English channel. Between the attack of English ships, and a storm by which the Spanish fleet was overtaken, the enterprise was frustrated; and Elizabeth, who had so vigorously prepared for the occasion, proceeded in procession to St Paul's, to return thanks for the defeat. But with this memorable victory her opposition to Spain did not finally terminate, and, in the parliament which met in February, 1593, she discoursed of the reasons which she had for hostility to that country, adding, in reference to the king of Spain, "I am informed that when he attempted the last invasion, some upon the sea-coast forsook their towns, fled up higher into the country, and left all naked and exposed to his entrance: but I swear unto you, if I knew those persons, or may know of any that shall do so hereafter, I will make them feel what it is to be fearful in so urgent a cause." In a like imperious style she rebuked the commons, during the same session, for interfering with the mode of collecting purveyance for her family, instead of leaving that matter to her, as mistress of her own household; and she also renewed her caution against parliamentary interference with ecclesiastical affairs.

If Elizabeth used freedom in reproving parliament, she used similar liberty in regard to individuals connected with her person. When her chaplain, Nowel, was preaching before her majesty, he expressed himself somewhat freely it seems, respecting the sign of the cross, on which the queen called out from the window of her closet, telling the preacher to "retire from that ungodly digression, and return unto his text." The following letter to a prelate is illustrative at once of a profane phraseology to which she was addicted, and of her peremptory and imperious style:—"Proud prelate, I understand you are backward in complying with your agreement; but I would have you know, that I, who made you what you are, can unmake you; and if you do not forthwith fulfil your engagement, by God, I will immediately unfrock you. Your's, as you demean yourself, Elizabeth." It appears she even beat her maids of honour. Nay, on one occasion, she inflicted a blow on the earl of Essex, who had taken a distinguished part in the Spanish war, and had become a favourite of the queen. By the rudeness of Elizabeth on this occasion, the spirit of the earl was mortally incensed, but he was soon received again into her favour, and, in 1599, she sent him to Ireland as lord-lieutenant, with a view to the quelling of a rebellion which had occurred in that part of her dominions. But this appointment—the expression of her regard—was to prove the cause of its withdrawal from that rash though gallant nobleman. On this occasion, he chose, as master of the horse, the earl of Southampton, who, by a private marriage, had displeased the queen. She rebuked Essex for the appointment. He withdrew it, but having proved unsuccessful in Ire-

land, and hearing that the queen was offended at his measures, he suddenly set out from that country, and forthwith appeared in the presence of his royal mistress. She received him kindly, but almost immediately after began that course of imprisonment and judicial investigations which terminated—not without ground—in the execution of the earl. During the proceedings the queen appears decidedly displeased with Essex, although after he had been committed to confinement in his own house, and had been seized with illness, she expressed sorrow, and said that, were it honourable so to do, she would visit him. For a conspiracy to seize on the palace, and induce Elizabeth to change her ministers and call a parliament, he was tried and executed, 25th February, 1602.¹⁰ But, in this last transaction of his melancholy end, the queen afforded another example of indecision, first signing the warrant, then recalling it, and thereafter repeating the same course.

Elizabeth now entered into negotiations with the king of France respecting the balance of power in Europe. Rosni, the French ambassador, expressed a very high opinion of her character, as exhibited upon this occasion; and in parliament, which met in October, an agreement on the part of the queen to rescind the more oppressive of the existing monopolies—the granting of which she had used as a method of rewarding services—drew forth, in the house of commons, torrents of flattering compliment, or enthusiastic admiration.

But her years were almost numbered. Age had overtaken her, little inclined as she seems to have been to have her ‘winding-sheet,’ as she expressed it, ‘pinned up before her eyes.’ The death of her prudent and valuable counsellor, Lord Burleigh, in 1598, is said to have often drawn forth her tears. Leicester too was gone, and Essex had perished by her own permission. There were many dark spots in the escutcheon of her glory; and from the gay scenes which she had loved, and the political transactions wherein she had triumphed, she was soon to be withdrawn. “These things will please you less when you feel creeping-time at your gate,” said she, in 1602, to Sir John Harrington, when he read some verses in her hearing. Even in that year Harrington represents her as a mournful spectacle. But the dimness of evening was soon exchanged for the gloom of a later and darker hour. A deep melancholy settled on that masculine spirit which, through so long a reign, had ruled the destinies of England. To account for this painful visitation, the following anecdote—which later evidence appears to have rendered very probable—has been adduced. The queen, after the return of Essex from Cadiz, gave him a ring as a pledge of her favour, should he send it to her in an occasion of extremity. On his condemnation, he intrusted it to the countess of Nottingham to present to his royal mistress. Her husband being the enemy of Essex, induced the countess not to convey it to the queen. The countess became ill, and conscience-stricken respecting her conduct in the matter, received a visit from Elizabeth, to whom she explained the story of the ring, which the queen had thought Essex through obstinacy forbore to send, and who, roused to passion by the disclosure of the countess, shook her in bed, declaring “that God might pardon her, but she never could;”

¹⁰ Camden.

and forthwith gave herself up to that melancholy which darkened the closing days of her brilliant life. The queen lay for more than a week on the carpet, leaning on cushions. A few words which she uttered indicated the malady within. The earl of Monmouth says, "On Wednesday, the 23d of March, she grew speechless. That afternoon, by signs, she called for her council, and by putting her hand to her head when the king of Scots was named to succeed her, they all knew he was the man she desired should reign after her." Mr D'Israeli has discovered a curious document which he supposes to have been drawn up by Petyt from the information of an eye-witness. It is entitled, 'Account of the last words of Queen Elizabeth about her successor,' and proceeds thus;—"On the Tuesday before her death, being the twenty-third of March, the admiral being on the right side of her bed, the lord-keeper on the left, and Mr Secretary Cecil (afterwards earl of Salisbury,) at the bed's feet, all standing, the lord-admiral put her in mind of her speech concerning the succession had at Whitehall, and that they, in the name of all the rest of her council, came unto her to know her pleasure who should succeed; whereupon she thus replied:—"I told you my seat had been the seat of kings, and I will have no rascal to succeed me. And who should succeed me but a king?" The lords not understanding this dark speech, and looking one on the other; at length Mr Secretary boldly asked her what she meant by those words, that 'no rascal should succeed her.' Whereto she replied, that her meaning was, that a king should succeed: 'and who,' quoth she, 'should that be but our cousin of Scotland?' They asked her whether that were her absolute resolution? whereto she answered, 'I pray you trouble me no more; for I will have none but him.' With which answer they departed. Notwithstanding, after again, about four o'clock in the afternoon the next day, being Wednesday, after the archbishop of Canterbury and other divines had been with her, and left her in a manner speechless, the three lords aforesaid repaired unto her again, asking her if she remained firm in her former resolution, and who should succeed her? but not being able to speak, was asked by Mr Secretary in this sort:—"We beseech your majesty, if you remain in your former resolution, and that you would have the king of Scots to succeed you in your kingdom, show some sign unto us:" whereat, suddenly heaving herself upwards in her bed, and putting her arms out of bed, she held her hands jointly over her head in manner of a crown; whence, as they guessed, she signified that she did not only wish him the kingdom but desired continuance of his estate: after which they departed, and the next morning she died. Immediately after her death, all the lords, as well of the council as other noblemen that were at the court, came from Richmond to Whitehall by six o'clock in the morning, where other noblemen that were in London met them. Touching the succession, after some speeches of divers competitions and matters of state, at length the admiral rehearsed all the aforesaid promises which the late queen had spoken to him, and to the lord-keeper, and Mr Secretary (Cecil) with the manner thereof; which they being asked, did affirm to be true, upon their honour."

Elizabeth's character stands prominently out on the annals of her reign. Early eminent for classical learning, she carried her literary pursuits into maturer life, and Ascham states that he had heard her

give fluent and appropriate replies, in Italian, French, and Latin, to three ambassadors at once. That she was not munificent in her patronage of learning, her parsimonious character, as well as the poverty of Ascham, her tutor, and Spencer, her poet-laureate, seem to render probable; but, that she did patronise it is well known to those acquainted with the literary history of her 'golden days.' She was surrounded by a galaxy not only of literary genius, but of political and military talent; yet she directly exercised a mighty personal influence in the transactions of her reign. Proud and imperious, she seems to have used as a principle which she would not permit her subjects to overlook, the sentiment she enforced on Leicester—"I will have here but one mistress, and no master." Influence seems to have been a leading object of her measures, and power a weapon which she could at once graciously and fearlessly employ. Thus, indeed, it might be possible to explain that union of great and sordid qualities which marks her character. For it is a great moral fact, that she seems to have been passionate, intolerant, vain, and parsimonious, eminent as she was in intellect, literary in taste, condescending in manners, protestant in faith, powerful in rule, and illustrious in fame.

Sir Thomas Chaloner.

BORN A. D. 1515.—DIED A. D. 1565.

ONE of the most distinguished ornaments of the 16th century, was Sir Thomas Chaloner, a gallant soldier, an able statesman, and an accomplished author. He was born in 1515, of a good family in Wales, and was sent to Cambridge at an early age, but soon distinguished himself at college by the elegance of his Latin verses. The friendship of several influential men introduced him to court, and he was almost immediately selected to attend Sir Henry Knevet, the English ambassador, into Germany. At the court of Charles V., young Chaloner was received with extraordinary favour, and became so much attached to the emperor, that he was early persuaded to accompany him in his unfortunate expedition against Algiers. In the great storm which dashed in pieces the emperor's fleet, Chaloner suffered shipwreck; but whilst struggling for his life amid the waves, he fortunately caught hold of a vessel's cable by which he was drawn upon deck with the loss of several of his teeth.

On his return to England he was made clerk of the council, which office he held during the remainder of Henry's reign. Under the protectorate, he attended the English forces into Scotland, and greatly distinguished himself in the battle of Pinkey, in the presence of Somerset, who conferred the honour of knighthood upon him on the field. The fall of his patron put a stop to his political advancement, for such was his high sense of honour that he could not stoop to make court to the man who had raised himself upon the ruins of one to whom he felt himself under many obligations. His loyalty to his prince, however, and the vigilant and careful manner in which he continued to discharge his official duties, preserved him in office, and protected him from any annoyance; while the friendship of such men as Cheke,

Cook, Smith, and Cecil, combined with his own literary tastes and habits, enabled him to fill up his retirement in such a way as left him little to regret in the loss of political honours.

The accession of Mary placed a man of Chaloner's open and uncompromising character in considerable danger; for, while a zealous Protestant, he could not stoop to any of those artifices by which some endeavoured to evade suspicion and retain office; but many of his Catholic friends now remembered with gratitude the services which he had rendered them during the reign of Mary's predecessor, and hastened to return his kindness by extending to him their protection in turn. On the accession of Elizabeth, Sir Thomas appeared at court with his former lustre, and was soon after sent as ambassador to Ferdinand of Germany. He acquitted himself in this important measure entirely to the satisfaction of the queen, who, on his return from Ferdinand's court, immediately despatched him on a like embassy to Spain. At the Spanish court—as he had indeed anticipated—he was very ill received, and he soon after petitioned for his recall; but Elizabeth refused to grant his request, affirming that she had no one else who could supply his place. Philip's ministers tried to bully the English envoy, but Sir Thomas kept up his spirit, and convinced them that neither he nor his royal mistress were to be trifled with. To relieve the ennui of his disagreeable situation at the court of Philip, he amused himself with composing his treatise on 'the right ordering of the English republic;' but falling into bad health, he was necessitated to petition again for his recall, which he did by addressing his sovereign in an elegy after the manner of Ovid, setting forth his earnest desire to revisit his native country ere the disease which now preyed upon him forced him upon a longer journey. The petition of the poet was granted, and Sir Thomas returned to England with a broken constitution, in the latter end of the year 1564. He died on the 7th of October, next year, and was buried in St Paul's, his friend, Sir William Cecil, officiating as chief mourner.

Sir Thomas was the author of several tracts, besides his work '*De Republica Anglorum instauranda*,' which was published at London, in quarto, in 1579.

Lady Catherine Grey.

DIED A. D. 1567.

AFTER the death of Lady Jane, her sister, Lady Catherine, became the heiress of the house of Suffolk, and, next to the queen of Scots, the first princess of the blood. It will be remembered that this lady had been affianced to Lord Herbert, son of the earl of Pembroke, on the same day that Guildford Dudley received her sister's hand, but had been repudiated by that time-serving nobleman as soon as the fortunes of her family waned before the ascendancy of Mary Tudor. From this time Lady Catherine remained in neglect and obscurity, but was privately married to the earl of Hertford, the son of the protector Somerset, notwithstanding the deadly feud which subsisted between these two families. The consequences of this union became apparent in August,

1560, when Lady Catherine declared herself to be the lawful wife of the earl, and was immediately committed to the Tower. Guildford was in the meantime summoned to appear before certain commissioners with evidence of the alleged marriage; but being at the moment absent in France, he found it impossible to collect his evidence in time, and the commissioners thereupon pronounced the marriage null, and sentenced both parties to be imprisoned during the queen's pleasure. Elizabeth unquestionably had no right to any such exercise of prerogative over Lady Catherine, whose degree of relationship to the queen was not so near as to render her marriage without the royal consent illegal; but the spirit of the times admitted of such violations of the liberty of the subject, and it was Elizabeth's avowed policy, whether sound or not, to keep contending claims to the crown suspended upon herself as long as possible.

In the warrant for her imprisonment addressed to the lieutenant of the Tower, that officer is commanded "to examine the Lady Catherine very sharply, how many hath been privy to the love between her and the earl of Hertford from the beginning, and let her certainly understand that she shall have no manner of favour except she will show the truth, not only what ladies or gentlewomen of the court were thereto privy but also what lords and gentlemen."¹ But Elizabeth's indignation was destined to receive a fresh impulse from the unconquerable attachment of the lovers, who contrived to elude the watchfulness of their gaolers, so that a second pregnancy was soon announced. Warren, the lieutenant of the Tower, was instantly dismissed, and Hertford was fined £15,000 in the star-chamber for the threefold offence of deflowering a female of the blood royal, of repeating that outrage after sentence of nullity, and of breaking prison. But the public voice was unanimously in favour of the hapless pair, and it was loudly asked by what right, or upon what principles of law, human or divine, her majesty presumed to keep asunder those whom God had joined? The breaking out of the plague produced some relaxation of severity to the noble prisoners, and Lady Hertford was allowed to retire from the city to the country-seat of her uncle Lord John Grey. But the queen's resentment still burned against the offenders, and in 1565, both were recommitted to the Tower. Lady Hertford was kept in custody till the day of her death in 1567, and the earl her husband suffered a farther imprisonment of three years. Lady Catherine upon her death-bed evinced much of the calmness and resignation which had characterized the last moments of her unfortunate sister. She besought those who attended her to solicit Elizabeth's protection for her three infant sons; and taking off her wedding-ring desired it to be sent to her husband. She then closed her eyes with her own hands, and breathed out her spirit without a struggle or sigh. Half a century after, the validity of her marriage was pronounced by a jury.

¹ Burleigh papers.

Herbert, Earl of Pembroke.

BORN A. D. 1507.—DIED A. D. 1570.

THIS peer was the offspring of an illegitimate son of William Herbert, earl of Pembroke. Coming early to court to push his fortune, he became an esquire of the body to Henry VIII. Like his contemporary, and fellow in good fortune, Paulet, marquis of Winchester, Herbert early in life adopted the prudent maxim, "*ortus sum ex salice, non ex quereu*,"—a maxim which he never once lost sight of during his long public life, and to which he certainly was indebted for his personal immunity from the effects of those stormy agitations which so often prostrated more unbending spirits around him. By his supple compliance with Henry's whims and pleasures he quickly ingratiated himself with that monarch, who, with his customary profusion towards his favourites, made him several enormous grants of abbey-lands in some of the southern counties. In the year 1544, we find him holding the king's license "to retain thirty persons at his will and pleasure, over and above such persons as attended on him, and to give them his livery, badges, and cognisance." Henry's marriage with Catherine Parr, the sister of Herbert's wife, increased his influence and importance in the state.

In the beginning of Edward's reign he obtained the appointment of master of the horse in consideration of his eminent services in checking some commotions in Wales and Wiltshire. Soon after, his services against the Cornish rebels procured for him the order of the garter and the presidency of the council for Wales. We next find him commanding part of the forces in Picardy, and governor of Calais, for which he obtained the revival in his own person of the titles of Baron Herbert and earl of Pembroke which had become extinct by the failure of legitimate heirs. The fall of Somerset and rise of Northumberland was of course followed by a suitable change in Pembroke's views and policy. And the new protector deemed his alliance of sufficient consequence to strengthen it by proposing a marriage between Pembroke's son, Lord Herbert, and his own daughter Lady Catherine Grey. This connexion, however, neither blinded Pembroke to the true aspect of the times, nor induced him to compromise his own interests for one moment in the brief struggle for royal ascendancy which followed on the proclamation of Lady Jane Grey. For, though he concurred in the first measures of the privy council in behalf of Lady Jane's title, he no sooner perceived the exact position and strength of parties than he reversed his policy, and from a supporter became a fatal opponent of Northumberland's measures. It was at his house that the lords assembled who first adopted the resolution of proclaiming the Lady Mary; and it was Pembroke who seconded Arundel's proposal to that effect in a speech of extreme violence. By this act of subtle policy he at once extricated himself from the difficulties of his former position, and secured the favour of the new queen, whom he farther propitiated by afterwards compelling his son to repudiate Lady Catherine. Mary confided to him the charge of suppressing Wyatt's rebellion, and rewarded his success in

that important trust by appointing him her captain-general beyond the seas.

The accession of Elizabeth furnished Pembroke with new occasion for the exercise of his accommodating policy, and we find him not only retaining his seat in the privy-council, but honoured with the special favour and confidence of the Protestant queen, being appointed with the marquis of Northampton, the earl of Bedford, and Lord John Grey, the leading men of the Protestant party, to assist at the meetings of divines and men of learning by whom the religious establishment of the country was to be settled. He died in 1570, in the 63d year of his age.

Sir Ralph Sadler.

BORN A. D. 1507.—DIED A. D. 1587.

SIR RALPH SADLER, the son of Henry Sadler, or Sadleyer, a gentleman of small fortune, was born at Hackney in Middlesex, in the year 1507. In early life he obtained a situation in the family of Cromwell, earl of Essex, through whose short-lived influence he was first placed in the way to promotion. Having filled some inferior appointments, he was advanced by Henry VIII. to a seat in the privy-council. He was employed by Henry in the great work of dissolving the religious houses, and, acquitting himself to the satisfaction of his master, was rewarded with his full share of the spoil. But the most important part of his political life was passed in repeated embassies to Scotland, in all of which he displayed much dexterity, and won the fullest confidence of his successive sovereigns. Two large volumes of his letters to the English court, written during these services, have been edited by W. Clifford, and form a valuable contribution to our published state-papers. His first embassy to Scotland was made in 1537, and had for its secret object to strengthen the English interests in the council of regency, which then governed the kingdom. His next mission, undertaken in 1539, was intended to detach King James from the councils of Cardinal Beaton, his chief minister, and to persuade him to follow the example of his uncle, Henry, by introducing the reformed religion into Scotland. The diplomatist was baffled on this occasion; but the death of James, and the accession of his daughter Mary, altered the form of English policy, and Sadler was again despatched to Scotland, in 1543, for the purpose of negotiating a marriage betwixt Prince Edward and the infant princess; but notwithstanding of the zeal and ability which Sadler displayed on this occasion, he completely failed in his object, and was compelled precipitately to withdraw himself from the furious political storm which his intrigues had occasioned. In the war with Scotland which followed, Sadler, now Sir Ralph, was constituted military treasurer; from the protector, Somerset, he also received a confirmation of all the church-lands which Henry had bestowed on him, with several new grants.

During Mary's reign, Sadler, who was a zealous reformer, prudently withdrew from public life, and remained at home in strictest privacy. But the accession of Elizabeth called him from his retirement; and being again sent into Scotland, he became the principal agent from the

English court in that country, during the extraordinary scene of political and religious commotion which preceded the introduction of the reformation into Scotland. The letters written by Sadler at this eventful period are numerous and extremely interesting. The unfortunate queen of Scotland was placed under Sir Ralph's charge at Tutbury, for eight months towards the close of her life. In this odious service he displayed a manlier and more feeling heart than any of Mary's other keepers; her misfortunes touched his sympathy,—he believed her innocent of the offences laid to her charge; and he hastened to communicate the favourable opinion which he had formed of her both to Elizabeth herself, and her minister Cecil. Elizabeth immediately removed Mary from Sadler's charge, but that she did not cease to confide in him is evident from her employing him shortly afterwards in a mission to James VI. to dissuade that prince from going to war with England on his mother's account. Sir Ralph made a discreditable marriage, for on the 9th of December, 1554, an act of parliament was passed to legitimate his children by Ellen, his wife; and Matthew Barre, her former husband, is therein stated to be at that time alive. He died on the 30th of March, 1587.

Sir Nicholas Bacon.

BORN A. D. 1510.—DIED A. D. 1579.

SIR NICHOLAS BACON, lord-keeper of the great seal in the reign of Elizabeth, was descended from an ancient and honourable family of Suffolk, and was born, in 1510, at Chislehurst in Kent. At an early age he was entered of Corpus Christi college, Cambridge; and, after studying there some years, he went to France, to give the last polish to his education. On his return home he fixed himself at Gray's inn, where he applied with great assiduity to the study of the law, and, in the 38th year of Henry VIII., we find him promoted to the office of attorney in the court of wards. His patent to this honourable and lucrative office was renewed in the succeeding brief reign; but the accession of Mary threw a transient cloud over his fortunes. In the very dawn of Elizabeth's reign he received the honour of knighthood; and, on the seals being taken from Archbishop Heath, they were transferred, with the title of lord-keeper, to Sir Nicholas Bacon, on the 22d of December, 1558.

In the parliament which met in January, 1559, and in which, it was anticipated, the queen's title to the crown, and her marriage, would come under discussion, the lord-keeper afforded his royal mistress the most prudent and judicious advice, counselling her not to press the repeal of those acts of her father's reign, which had declared his marriage with her mother null, and herself illegitimate; but to repose in the maxim of law—that the crown, once worn, takes away all defects in blood. He also opened the parliament in the queen's presence, and afterwards headed the deputation from the commons in the special matter of her majesty's marriage. But the principal business of the session was the settlement of the ecclesiastical affairs of the nation, and in this delicate and important task Sir Nicholas acquitted himself with

great prudence and moderation. When, in order to dissolve or neutralize the opposition to the new measures, five bishops and three doctors, on the one side, and eight reformed divines on the other, received the royal command to hold a public disputation on certain controverted points, the lord-keeper was commissioned to act as moderator, and acquitted himself with perfect fairness, although some Catholic writers have attempted to fasten a charge of partiality upon him.

In 1564, his favour with the queen was somewhat endangered by the appearance of a treatise in favour of the claims of the Suffolk line to the English crown, and against the title of the queen of Scots, which greatly excited Elizabeth's displeasure, but which the lord-keeper was suspected of secretly approving and circulating. This storm, however, soon passed over, and, in 1568, Bacon was placed at the head of the commission for hearing and determining the differences between the queen of Scots and her rebellious subjects.

Sir Nicholas died on the 20th of February, 1579. Camden has thus sketched his character: "*Vir præpinguis, ingenio acerrimo, singulari prudentiâ, summa eloquentiâ, tenaci memoriâ, et sacris conciliis alterum columnen*;" that is, "a man of a gross body, but most subtle wit, of singular prudence, of high eloquence, of a retentive memory, and, for judgment, the other pillar of the state." His son's character of him is more striking. "He was," says the great Lord Bacon, speaking of his father, "a plain man, direct and constant, without all finesse and doubleness, and one that was of a mind, that a man, in his private proceedings and estate, and in the proceedings of state, should rest upon the soundness and strength of his own causes, and not upon practice to circumvent others, according to the sentence of Solomon, '*vir prudens advertit ad gressus suos; stultus autem divertit ad dolorem*;' insomuch that the bishop of Rosse, a subtle and observing man, said of him, that he could fasten no words upon him, and that it was impossible to come within him, because he offered no play; and the queen-mother of France, a very polite princess, said of him, that he should have been of the council of Spain, because he despised the occurrents, and rested upon the first plot." Sir Nicholas was an acute, and, what was rarer in his days, a cautious statesman. His great skill lay in balancing factions,—a secret which he probably imparted to his royal mistress, who proved no unapt pupil in his hands. As lord-keeper, he distinguished himself by the very moderate use which he made of his powers, and by the respect which he manifested on all occasions for the common law. He had not been many months in office, as keeper of the great seal, before he began to entertain some doubts as to the precise extent of his authority in that capacity, owing perhaps to the very general terms used upon the delivery of the great seals.¹ Upon this he applied to her majesty, from whom he procured a patent, declaring him to have as full powers as if he were chancellor of England. But this did not fully satisfy him, and, four years afterwards, an act of parliament was passed, which declares that "the common law always was, the keeper of the great seal always had, as of right belonging to his office, the same authority, jurisdiction, execution of laws, and all other customs, as the lord-chancellor of England lawfully used." Bishop Tanner has enrolled Sir Nicholas

¹ See Rymer's *Fœdera*, *passim*.

Bacon among the writers of his country, on account of numerous pieces of his, chiefly speeches in council and parliament, which are still preserved in manuscript collections. Mr Masters also notices a comment of his on the twelve minor prophets.

Sir Thomas Gresham.

BORN A. D. 1519.—DIED A. D. 1579.

SIR THOMAS GRESHAM was the younger son of Sir Richard Gresham, who died, February, 1548. Sir Richard was a wealthy merchant, —a man of considerable public spirit, which is evinced by his successively filling the offices of alderman, sheriff, and lord-mayor of the city of London. His brother, Sir John Gresham, was also an opulent merchant, and attained the same honours. He died of a malignant fever in 1556. He was known by many acts of munificence, but by none more splendid than the endowing of the free school of Holt, in Norfolk, with the government of which he invested the fish-mongers' company in London. Thomas, the subject of the present sketch, was born in London, 1519. When young, he was bound apprentice to a mercer there. He did not long remain in this situation, but was sent to Caius college, Cambridge, then called Gonville hall, that he might receive an education worthy of his fortune. He here made such progress that he acquired the name of 'Doctissimus mercator.' The commercial spirit within him, however, was too strong for the spirit of literature, and the splendid prospects which trade opened at this period induced him to engage in it. He was admitted member of the merchants' company in 1543, soon after which he married Ann, the daughter of William Fernely, Esq., of West Creting, Suffolk; and during the remainder of his father's life, prosecuted his mercantile pursuits with distinguished diligence. He was in hopes, at his father's death, of obtaining his situation, namely, as money-agent for the king at Antwerp. In this he was disappointed; this disappointment, however, was the means of a more rapid rise of fortune eventually. For the successful candidate for the office, having, by his mismanagement, involved the king's affairs in all but inextricable confusion, Gresham was chosen to the arduous duty of retrieving them. This difficult task he performed with the most distinguished ability. He found the affairs of his sovereign in a most embarrassed state, and the general method of transacting them such as must perpetually add to those embarrassments. It appears that money had been borrowed for the English monarch at an enormous interest, and that, when not taken up at the specified period, an extension of time was to be purchased only by several humiliating and embarrassing conditions. This mode of transacting business neither suited the commercial habits of Gresham, nor comported, as he thought, with the dignity of the British crown. And so effectual was the system he adopted in its stead, that, in the course of two years, he paid off the whole of a large loan, though shackled with a large accumulation of interest, and of course raised the king's credit to an unprecedented height. His plan for effecting this object was so ingenious that we cannot allow it to pass unmentioned. He secretly procured

from England a weekly sum of £1300 or £1400, and, with this supply, he took up about £200 sterling daily, or £73,000 a-year. These small daily sums, exciting no suspicion, caused no fall of the exchange. He also advised the king to take into his own hands all the lead in his dominions, and then, after forbidding its exportation for four or five years, dole it out at Antwerp, at the extravagant price to which such a monopoly could not fail to raise it. So much was Gresham in request, and that too for the management of political as well as pecuniary matters, that it is supposed that, during the short reign of Edward VI., he made not less than forty journeys to Antwerp; services for which that monarch gave him the most flattering tokens of his regard. At the accession of Queen Mary, he was deprived of his agency,—a piece of injustice which elicited from him a memorial of his past services, the statement of which induced the queen to reinstate him in all his former employments. After Queen Mary's death, he remained in office under Elizabeth, who employed him in several most important and difficult money transactions in this eventful reign. Honour and wealth now flowed in upon him apace. He was knighted, and appointed general-agent to her majesty for foreign parts. He justly thought that this elevation in rank and accession of wealth warranted his adopting a superior style of living, and he therefore built a magnificent mansion in Bishopsgate-street, afterwards called Gresham college. In the midst of all this prosperity, however, he was reminded how easily it might be marred, and how slight is the tenure by which it is held, by the sudden death of an only son, in 1564, at sixteen.

To divert his mind and soothe his grief, this princely merchant strove to forget the desolation of his own hearth, by turning his thoughts abroad, and devising schemes of public utility. Prosperity had not rendered him selfish.

The London merchants, at this period, used to meet in Lombard-street, in the open air, exposed to all the inclemency of the weather. Sir Thomas's father had proposed the building of a house or exchange, in imitation of that of Antwerp, but died without doing any thing towards the accomplishment of his object. His son undertook it with greater spirit and a better prospect of success. He promised the citizens of London, that if they would provide a piece of ground, of the necessary size, and in a suitable situation, he would erect an exchange at his private expense. This munificent offer was gladly accepted, and eighty houses occupying the alleys known by the name of Swan-alley, New-alley and St Christopher's alley, were purchased for this object for the sum of £3,532. This was in 1566. In June he laid the foundation stone; and in November of 1567 the shell was finished and the roof slated; and the building was completed in three years.

The exchange at Antwerp was the model of this structure; in shape it was an oblong; it was surrounded by a portico of marble pillars, under which were shops. In 1570, Elizabeth paid this magnificent building a visit and conferred on it the name of the Royal exchange: the name still possessed by its successor. This noble building was consumed in the great fire of London. While engaged in this grand design, all his skill was required in the transaction of certain important money affairs of her majesty. Owing to the quarrel between Elizabeth and the king of Spain, the English merchants had been compelled to

ship their goods for Hamburg, on which Duke Alva, governor of the Netherlands, prohibited all commerce with England. The secretary Cecil was extremely fearful lest the queen, by the defalcation in the revenues consequent on this interrupted state of commerce, should be unable to pay her foreign creditors. The sagacity of Sir Thomas Gresham, however, helped him through all his difficulties. At the same time, to prevent in future the queen's being placed in such precarious circumstances, he strongly advised that she should borrow of her own subjects in preference to foreigners. But when this project was first explained to the merchants, it met with their decided opposition and was negatived in the common-hall. Upon more mature consideration, however, and something like a menace from the privy-council, they acceded to the proposal, and had no cause to repent it. This was the humble origin of those vast sums which the merchant-body have since advanced to the state.

In 1572, the queen did Gresham the honour of appointing him—together with the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of London, and others—assistant to the lord-mayor in the government of the city during her summer-progress. About this time Sir Thomas added to the numerous purchases he had before made in various parts of the kingdom, that of Osterly-park, near Brentford, as a ready retreat from the cares of business and the bustle of the city. Here he built a magnificent residence, and laid out vast sums in improving and adorning the estate; at the same time, never forgetting the useful in the elegant, nor the character of a prudent merchant in that of an opulent citizen, he built several mills on the river Brent. An amusing anecdote is told in connection with his residence at Osterly-park. It is said that Queen Elizabeth, when on a visit to him at that place, having suggested that some alteration would be a great improvement, the gallant merchant sent to London for workmen that very night, and by dawn of day, to the unspeakable surprise of the queen, the work was completed. A witty courtier remarked on the occasion that it was not to be wondered at that he who had “so soon built a change,” should as “easily change a building.”

Our princely merchant now began to entertain another magnificent project, namely, that of turning his mansion in Bishopsgate-street into a seat of learning and of science, and endowing it for the benefit of future generations. The education Sir Thomas Gresham had received at Caius college, had freed him from many of the low and illiberal prejudices against knowledge and science too often cherished by men of business. He saw that literature was by no means incompatible with commercial shrewdness and sagacity, and that the more enlarged a man's views are, the greater is his power in whatever situation he may be placed. The great monopolists of learning—Oxford and Cambridge—endeavoured to dissuade him from his design, but in vain; and Sir Thomas's mansion was henceforth destined for lecturers and professors of the seven liberal sciences, all of whom were to be salaried from the revenues of the Royal exchange. It was called Gresham college; it is now transformed into the excise office.

In addition to these public acts of munificence, the private charities of our merchant were most liberal. His will provides for the erection and support of eight alms houses, and £10 yearly to several prisons and

hospitals. Sir Thomas died suddenly in November 21, 1579, in the full enjoyment of his prosperity. He was buried in St Helen's church with great pomp and with every demonstration of public regret. His character is best gathered from the tenour of his life. His commercial abilities were unrivalled; he was a liberal patron of the sciences and the arts; cautious and sagacious, he knew how to make money,—municipal, hospitable, generous, he knew how to show it. He was one of the few whom prosperity cannot spoil; the same amidst riches and honours as he had been in humble circumstances. He was dignified without pride, magnificent without ostentation, generous but not lavish; he was one of those very rare men of simplicity, worth, and true practical wisdom, who know what is due to every situation, and can adapt their conduct with a nice and accurate adjustment to all the varying circumstances of fortune. A more worthy name than that of Sir Thomas Gresham does not adorn the page of English history.

Sir Nicholas Throckmorton.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1513.—DIED A. D. 1571.

SIR NICHOLAS THROCKMORTON, the fourth son of Sir George Throckmorton, an officer of Henry the Eighth's household, was born about the year 1513. While yet a boy he became attached to the duke of Richmond's suite in the quality of page, and he accompanied his master and the earl of Surrey in their mission to France. In 1544, he commanded a troop in the expedition against France, and acquitted himself to Henry's satisfaction. On the death of Henry he attached himself to the queen-dowager, which introduced him to the princess Elizabeth's notice. In 1547 he served in the Scottish campaign, and greatly distinguished himself at the battle of Pinkey. The protector sent him to London with the news of that victory, and soon after this he was knighted, and obtained an office in the privy chamber. He appears to have stood well with Edward VI.; but, having embraced the protestant doctrines in early life, the accession of Mary threw a cloud over his fortunes, and within a few months afterwards, he was arrested and sent to the Tower, on a charge of being accessory to Wyatt's rebellion. Never did the ingratitude of Mary appear in darker colours than in ordering the arrest of Sir Nicholas: for, protestant as he was, he had a great veneration for legitimacy, and was the very first to communicate to Mary the plans of Northumberland for the proclamation of Lady Jane Grey. In concert with his brother, he despatched Mary's goldsmith to Hunsden, where that princess then was, with the news of Edward's death. She at first hesitated to rely implicitly upon the intelligence, especially on being informed that it was Sir Nicholas who brought the news from Greenwich, remarking, that if Sir Robert—meaning his elder brother, who was a zealous papist—had been here, “she would have gaged her life upon the truth of it.”

We have already detailed the particulars of Wyatt's insurrection. Sir Nicholas was committed to the tower on the 20th of February, 1554, and on the 17th of April was brought to trial at Guildhall in London. There seems little doubt that he sympathized with, and even

afforded direct encouragement and assistance to the insurgents;¹ but he defended himself on his trial with so much boldness and dexterity that he was acquitted by the jury. He was remanded, however, to the Tower, and remained in custody till the 18th of January, 1555, when he obtained his release along with several other state-prisoners, at the solicitation of King Philip, who sought to gain the favour of his queen's subjects by this and other acts of leniency.

Soon after his discharge, Throckmorton went into France, where he became intimately acquainted with Sir James Melvil, the confidential adviser of Mary of Scotland, who speaks of him as his "oldest and dearest friend by long acquaintance," and says, "he was a devout friend to the queen, my mistress, and to her right and title to the succession to the crown of England." At the close of the year 1556, Throckmorton returned to England, and paid his court, but secretly, to the princess Elizabeth, who reposed much confidence in him, and employed him, on the report of Mary's death, to ascertain its truth—a piece of service which he faithfully and dexterously performed, and for which he was rewarded with the office of chief butler, no very lucrative appointment. Elizabeth found in him, however, a faithful and bold counsellor. He strenuously opposed the retaining of several zealous catholics, who had formed part of Mary's council, in their office of privy councillors. The queen, irritated at the freedom with which Throckmorton expressed his sentiments on this point, is said to have exclaimed, "God's death, villain, I will have thy head!" To which passionate threat he coolly replied, "You will do well, Madam, to consider first how long you will then be able to keep your own on your shoulders." Elizabeth, on reflection, saw the unreasonableness of her warmth and the force of Throckmorton's observation, and not long afterwards evinced her confidence in him by despatching him as her ambassador to France, in 1559, in which character he remained at the French court till 1563. His diplomatic correspondence during this period has been published, and displays considerable tact and shrewdness on the part of the ambassador. Secretary Cecil placed a high value on his services; but a short time before Throckmorton's return to England a misunderstanding occurred betwixt the ambassador and secretary, which determined the former to attach himself to the earl of Leicester's party.

In 1565, he was sent into Scotland to oppose Mary's projected marriage with Darnley, and encourage the earl of Murray's party in their opposition to that measure. On the imprisonment of Mary at Lochleven, in 1567, he was again sent into Scotland to negotiate for her release, and Melvil declares, that of all the English ambassadors, Throckmorton "dealt most honestly and plainly, for he shot at the union of the whole isle in one monarchy."² Whatever his merits were in these services, they were not adequately rewarded in his own apprehension, and he assumed the air and bearing of an ill-used man to such a degree, that 'weazen-faced Throckmorton' became a bye-word at court. In 1569, when the intrigue for a marriage between the queen of Scots and the duke of Norfolk was discovered, Throckmorton was

¹ See Criminal Trials in *Library of Entertaining Knowledge*, vol. i. p. 55.

² *Memoirs*, p. 89.

sent to the Tower on suspicion of being concerned in it. He was soon afterwards discharged; but he never regained Elizabeth's favour. His disappointments preyed deeply upon his spirits, and he died within a few months after his liberation, in the house of the earl of Leicester, on the 12th of February, 1571. Fuller hints that he was poisoned by Leicester, 'no mean artist in that faculty;' but the suspicion is not borne out by any adequate evidence.

Thomas, Duke of Norfolk.

BORN A. D. 1536.—DIED A. D. 1572.

THOMAS HOWARD, duke of Norfolk, was the eldest son of the earl of Surrey. He succeeded to the title and estates of his grandfather, the third duke of Norfolk, in August, 1554. After the death of his father he was placed under the care of his aunt, the duchess of Richmond, who appointed Fox, the martyrologist, his preceptor. Under such tuition, the young Norfolk imbibed the principles of the Reformation; and it is recorded to his praise, that he never forgot what he owed to his venerable and pious preceptor. On Elizabeth's accession, he was made a privy councillor, and honoured with the garter; and in 1559, he was appointed lieutenant-general of the north, a situation of peculiar trust and importance in these times. The discerning Cecil thus expresses the opinion he had formed of the duke in relation to this office: "Surely, I think, his grace will as discreetly, as honourably, as powerfully execute the commission, as any that hath gone before him. One notable quality he hath wherein is great commendation; he will do nothing almost of any moment in his private causes, but upon advice; which property shall be most convenient for this charge." Cecil was at this time secretly assisting the lords of the congregation against the queen-regent of Scotland; and the quality he here praises in Norfolk peculiarly fitted the duke for bearing his part as lord of the marches in the negotiation with the Scottish party.

At the time of Mary's flight into England, after the battle of Langside, the duke of Norfolk was the most powerful and popular nobleman in England. His rank as premier peer, his relationship to the queen and the favour in which he stood with her majesty, his personal qualities of munificence and affability, his connexion by blood with some of the first catholic families, and the confidence which his known principles induced the protestant party to repose in him,—all conspired to make him the first man in the state; and accordingly he was treated with the highest deference by both parties.

It is difficult now to trace the origin of the scheme of a marriage between the duke and the queen of Scotland. On the appointment of the commission for the purpose of hearing and determining the alleged matters of grievance betwixt Mary and her subjects, Norfolk was placed at the head of it. His duchess had died during the preceding year; and Mary had been for some time under the surveillance of Lady Scrope, the duke's sister, at Bolton. The bishop of Rosse, on his examination, declared that the scheme had been first suggested to Mary herself in a communication from the duke, previously to her

granting her final assent to the commission. The conferences at York commenced on the 4th of October, 1568. Murray declares that proposals were made to him by Norfolk for the suppression of all documents which might go to establish Mary's participation in the murder of Darnley, and that it was urged upon him, in reference to this point, that any undue exposure of Mary might be prejudicial to her son's interests, on whom the eyes of a considerable party were now set as the destined successor of Elizabeth on the throne of England. The duke, on his trial, strenuously denied the truth of this statement, but Melvil declares that the regent imparted to him the substance of his communication with the duke the same night. Whether or not these secret dealings were discovered or suspected by Elizabeth, measures were soon afterwards adopted which removed Mary from the influence of Norfolk or his agents. She herself was transferred from the charge of Lord Scrope to the custody of the earl of Shrewsbury, and the seat of the commission was removed from York to London; while the duke was despatched on military affairs to the northern marches. On Norfolk's return to court, Elizabeth exhibited manifest signs of dissatisfaction towards him; but the duke introduced the subject of his rumoured marriage with Mary himself, and affected to treat the whole as an idle and unfounded rumour. In the meantime, Murray delivered up the evidences which he possessed of Mary's connexion with Bothwell, chiefly consisting of those letters and sonnets whose genuineness has been since disputed with so much diligence of historical investigation and shrewdness of argument. Soon after the production of these papers the conference closed, and Elizabeth signified her determination to give no final judgment in the matter. Norfolk beheld the failure of his scheme, through Murray's breach of promise, with much indignation; and the bishop of Rosse, in his declaration, affirms, that for a time Norfolk was privy to and encouraged a plan to intercept and assassinate the regent on his return home.

Early in the year 1569, the proposal for the marriage of the duke with the queen of Scots was publicly entertained by a very powerful party of the English nobility; and a letter was written to Mary by the earls of Leicester, Arundel, and Pembroke, urging her consent to the measure, as calculated to secure the peace and well-being of both kingdoms, in the event of Elizabeth's death without issue. To this communication Mary returned a favourable answer; and a formal contract of marriage was drawn up and signed, and deposited with Fenelon the French ambassador. These arrangements were made unknown to Elizabeth, but Leicester engaged to take the first favourable opportunity of breaking the matter to her. It was not till the month of August, that the first rumour of this intrigue was conveyed to Elizabeth by some of her ladies. Leicester, shortly afterwards, revealed the whole transaction to her, and obtained her forgiveness for the part which he had taken in it. The first intimation which Elizabeth gave the duke of her acquaintance with his designs, was conveyed to him in the significant hint from her own lips, "to beware on what pillow he rested his head." The duke instantly took the alarm, and retired to Kenninghall in Norfolk; but a peremptory summons commanded his presence at court; and on the 9th of October, he was committed to the Tower. Elizabeth would have at first precipitated his trial; but the

cool and cautious Cecil succeeded in satisfying her of the impolicy of this. "If the duke," said he, "shall be charged with the crime of treason, and shall not be thereof convicted, he shall not only save but increase his credit. And surely, without his facts may appear manifest within the compass of treason (which I cannot see how they can), he shall be acquitted of that charge; and better it were in the beginning to foresee the matter, than to attempt it with discredit, and not without suspicion of evil will and malice." The want of sufficient evidence to convict the duke of treason, and the good offices of Cecil, finally procured the duke's liberation from the Tower, but he soon afterwards engaged himself in more treasonable practices.

In February, 1570, the plan of an embassy to the duke of Alva, the pope, and the king of Spain, was suggested by the queen of Scots, and communicated by the bishop of Rosse to the duke of Norfolk. The duke, it was declared by Rosse and Barber in their examination, assented to the scheme, which was nothing less than a proposal to form an alliance with the foreign powers just mentioned, and the catholic party of England, in support of the queen of Scots. The fact of a secret correspondence with foreign powers was early discovered, but the council were for a time baffled in their efforts to discover the traitors. At last the detection of a letter in cipher from Hickford, the duke's secretary, and the subsequent confessions and revelation of Hickford, and Barber, another confidant of the duke's, led to the arrest of Norfolk himself. Abundant matter for a charge of high treason was soon collected against him, and on the 16th of January, 1572, he was tried and pronounced guilty by his peers. Elizabeth manifested great reluctance, real or feigned, to consent to his execution; but, after four months delay, the fatal warrant was at last issued; and on the 3d of June, 1572, the duke was executed on Tower-hill. He acknowledged the justness of his sentence upon the scaffold, and met his death with becoming fortitude. "It is incredible," says Camden, "how much the people loved him; whose good-will he had gained by a munificence and extraordinary affability suitable to so great a prince. The wiser sort of men were variously affected; some were terrified at the greatness of the danger, which, during his life, seemed to threaten the state from him and his faction. Others were moved with pity towards him, as one very nobly descended, of an extraordinary good nature, comely personage, and manly presence, who might have been both a support and ornament to his country, had not the crafty wiles of the envious, and his own false hopes, led on with a show of doing the public service, diverted him from his first course of life. They called likewise to mind the untimely end of his father, a man of extraordinary learning, and famous in war, who was beheaded in the same place five and twenty years before." A very accurate report of the duke's trial has been got up from various sources by the editor of the 'Criminal Trials,' in that most meritorious publication, 'The Library of Entertaining Knowledge.'

Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester.

BORN A. D. 1532.—DIED A. D. 1588.

THIS nobleman was the son of John Dudley, created duke of Northumberland by Henry VIII. He was born about 1532. When his father was executed for high treason, in attempting to set aside Mary, for the lady Jane Grey, who had married his son, Lord Guildford Dudley, Robert, with the rest of the family, suffered from the displeasure of the dominant party, and, being included in an act of attainder, was condemned to suffer death. That penalty, however, was not inflicted; and, in the year 1558, an act passed to reverse the attainder, and Robert, with his brother Ambrose, was restored to his titles and possessions. He was, after this, frequently employed by Mary in diplomatic business.

Under the succeeding reign of Elizabeth, however, he rapidly advanced in preferment. That queen bestowed on him special marks of favour, first appointing him master of the horse; and, soon after, causing him—to the surprise of the public—to be installed knight of the garter. Scandalous reports were whispered and believed at home: in foreign courts it was openly said that they lived together in adulterous intercourse. Dudley had married the daughter and heiress of Sir John Robesart, but that lady was not permitted to appear at court: her lord allotted for her residence a lonely mansion called Cumnor, in Berkshire, where she suddenly died by an accidental fall, but under such suspicious circumstances, as to impress the public with the belief that she had been murdered. It was believed, indeed, that the queen had solemnly pledged her word to Dudley that she would become his wife, and a lady of the bed-chamber was named as witness to the contract. From opposition to this measure arising from the queen's ministers, and the scandalous reports spread abroad on the continent, it appears the marriage was postponed; but several years elapsed before the design was entirely abandoned. Meanwhile, Dudley was the supreme favourite at court: he was called only 'My lord' without any addition; all affairs were imparted through him; ambassadors gave account to him of their negotiations; every one plied his suit through him, for no other medium would be attended with success. Dudley, thus possessed of sole influence with the queen, was naturally an object of jealousy and hatred. To remove him from court, Cecil, it is said, recommended to the queen to propose him as the husband of her cousin, the queen of Scots. To this proposal she acceded, without however expecting that it would be accepted, or even wishing for it. To raise her favourite to a rank equal to his pretensions, she created him Earl of Leicester. The ceremony was performed at Westminster, in 1564, with great solemnity; the queen herself assisting, and Dudley sitting on his knees before her with great gravity, while she bestowed on him some familiar token of her favour. The Scottish queen, however, having rejected the earl of Leicester and decided in favour of Lord Darnley, there was some strong expectation raised that Elizabeth would take Leicester for herself, as she had told Sir James Melvil, that "she esteemed him as her brother and best friend; whom she herself would have married,

had she ever minded to have taken a husband." But by the persuasion of a party inimical to Leicester, Elizabeth was brought to think seriously of a foreign husband, and occasionally to dispute the ascendancy which Leicester assumed over her. She gave him hints of her displeasure in enigmatic notes: while he thought proper to absent himself from court, but whether in a fit of jealousy or by royal mandate does not appear. These occasional quarrels, however, only served, upon reconciliation, to confirm his influence. Publicly he affected to advocate the project of a foreign alliance, but privately he threw every obstacle in its way; and if he did not ultimately obtain the queen for himself, he succeeded at least, in extinguishing the hopes of every other suitor, whether native or foreigner. The archduke Charles of Austria, having renewed his suit to the queen, and being favoured by the earl of Sussex and his party, the queen was brought into her usual state of indecision, and meanwhile the irritation of the two noblemen against each other was such, that they went constantly armed, and were attended by armed men. The negotiation was protracted upwards of two years. Sometimes Sussex, sometimes Leicester prevailed. Sussex, however, having been despatched to Maximilian, the father of the arch-duke, as ambassador from Elizabeth, in his absence Leicester ruled without control, and the hopes of the arch-duke were entirely quashed by the peremptory requirement that in the event of his union with the queen, he must wholly relinquish the Catholic form of worship. Leicester continued thus established in the royal favour, and was principal in all the great affairs of state. In 1572, he was privately married to the lady Douglas, whom he never acknowledged as his wife, nor the son which she bore him as legitimate. On the death of the earl of Essex, in Ireland—not without suspicion of having been poisoned through the intervention of Leicester—the latter proposed to Lady Douglas, his wife, articles of separation: upon her refusal he is said to have had recourse to the same diabolical means of administering poison to her also, that there might be no obstacle to his union with the widow of Essex. They were privately married in 1576, unknown to the queen. Sinier, the representative of the duke of Anjou, who had renewed his suit to the queen, persuaded Elizabeth that it was beneath her dignity to take for her husband Leicester, a man who owed whatever he possessed to her bounty; and added the important information, that her favourite had recently married, without her knowledge, the widow of the late earl of Essex. Leicester let fall some hints of vengeance; but the irritated queen ordered him to be confined at Greenwich, and would have sent him to the Tower, but for the interposition of the earl of Sussex;—at the same time severely prohibiting any kind of insult to the French envoy.

Leicester at first united with Sussex, Burleigh, and Hunsdon, in urging the marriage of the queen, but afterwards opposed it on the ground of the duke's religion, and the improbability of an heir to the throne—the queen being in her forty-ninth year. The duke, however, pressed his suit, and Leicester, with others, was commanded to subscribe a written paper, regulating the rites to be observed, and the form of contract to be pronounced, by both parties at the celebration of the marriage. But though Leicester, with Walsingham and Hatton, at the royal command, had affixed his signature to the paper, he had

with them previously arranged a new plan of opposition. After every thing had been settled respecting the marriage, Elizabeth was so assailed by the tears and entreaties of her female attendants, who had received their lesson from Leicester and the others, that she finally broke off the match; and the duke, returning from her presence to his apartment, pensive and irritated, threw away the ring which his supposed bride had placed on his finger in token of her intentions, exclaiming, that the women of England were as changeable and capricious as the waves which encircled their island. The duke was, however, admitted afterward to the most familiar intimacy, and, on his departure, the queen ordered the earl of Leicester, with six lords and a numerous train of gentlemen, to accompany him as far as the city of Brussels. Leicester thus resumed his ascendancy over the queen, and continued at the head of affairs, and was particularly active in promoting the overture of the Belgian provinces to Elizabeth, to become their sovereign, and protect them in the profession of the reformed religion against the king of Spain. The queen yielded so far as to enter into a treaty of alliance with the Belgians, but the disgrace of aiding rebels who pretended to depose their lawful sovereign, haunted her minds and she strictly forbade Leicester, the commander of her forces, to engage in any enterprise, or to accept of any honour, which could be construed into an admission that Philip had lost the sovereignty of the provinces. But the views of the favourite were very different from those of his mistress. His ambition aspired to the place which had been possessed and forfeited by the duke of Anjou; and on his arrival in Holland, in December, 1585, he asked, and, after some demur, obtained from the gratitude of the states the title of 'Excellency,' the office of captain-general of the united provinces, and the whole control of the army, the finances, and the courts of judicature. He was attended by a splendid retinue of English noblemen and gentlemen, and wanted nothing but the name to constitute him a king.

When the news of these proceedings reached the queen, she manifested her displeasure in no measured terms. She charged Leicester with presumption and vanity, with contempt of the royal authority, with having sacrificed the honour of his sovereign to his own ambition; but when she was told that he had sent for his countess and was preparing to hold a court which in splendour should eclipse her own, she burst into a paroxysm of rage, swearing with great oaths, that she "would have no more courts under her obeysance than one, and that she would let the upstart know how easily the hand which had raised him could also beat him to the ground." Leicester, however, smiled at these threats and spent his time in progresses from one city to another: every where he gave and received the most sumptuous entertainments, and, on all occasions, displayed the magnificence of a sovereign prince. After the violence of the queen's paroxysm was over, she was persuaded by Lord Burleigh, to send her captain-general supplies for a campaign against the Spaniards. But Leicester proved no match for Farnese, the prince of Parma: the campaign proved unsuccessful; the states quarrelled with the earl, and he hastily returned to England at the command of the queen to assist her in the important affair of the queen of Scots. On his return, the earl instantly regained his influence with the queen, and, instead of punishment, met with

reward, being installed lord-steward of the household, and chief justice in Eyre south of the Trent.

During the absence of Leicester from Belgium, a party had been formed against him, and the States proceeded to the appointment of another head, in the person of Maurice, son of the late prince of Orange. Leicester, however, speedily found means to annul this proceeding by the influence which he had gained in the Netherlands over the reformed clergy. He had frequented their worship,—prayed, fasted; and received the sacrament with them,—and, on every occasion, had avowed a determination to extirpate popery, and to establish the gospel. Elizabeth felt the affront offered to her favourite as offered to herself, and the Lord Buckhurst was despatched to signify her displeasure. By his exertions matters were accommodated, and the fury of the people was appeased by a promise that Leicester should immediately return.

The queen, however, not wishing to protract the war with Spain, would have preferred that Leicester should remain at home, and that the contest should gradually subside. The earl, on the contrary, with his friends in the council, urged the continuation of the war. The conduct of Admiral Drake towards the Spaniards having provoked still greater hostilities, the States pressed the queen most urgently for the fulfilment of her promise, and at length Leicester took his departure for Holland, with a large sum of money, and a reinforcement of 5000 men. A misunderstanding, however, soon arose between the earl and the States, who accused the queen, his mistress, with avarice, in wishing to sell them to the king of Spain for a stipulated sum sufficient to defray the past expenses of the war. This charge, though unfounded and improbable, was circulated through the country, and the earl, from having been the idol, became, in a few days, the execration of the people. Mutual recriminations ensued, and the quarrel went such a length that Leicester lost ground with the queen. She believed that he had neglected her instructions, and sought chiefly his own aggrandizement; and when Farnese complained that the queen had no real desire for peace, she laid the blame, first on the negligence, and then on the ambition of Leicester. He was, therefore, recalled; and, on his arrival, aware of his danger, threw himself at her feet, and conjured her to have pity on her former favourite. “She had sent him to the Netherlands with honour,—would she receive him back in disgrace? She had raised him from the dust,—would she now bury him alive?” The appeal moved the heart of the queen, and Leicester was prepared for the summons on the following morning to appear before the council. There, instead of kneeling at the foot of the table, he took his accustomed seat; and, when the secretary began to read the charges which had been prepared, he arose, inveighed against the baseness and perfidy of his calumniators, and appealed from the prejudices of his equals to the equity of his sovereign. The members gazed on each other; the secretary passed to the ordinary business of the day, and the Lord Buckhurst, the accuser, was ordered to consider himself a prisoner in his own house.

Thus restored to his place in the affections of the queen and the councils of the nation, when the Spanish armada threatened England, the earl was appointed to the command of an army for the protection of the capital. These forces lay at Tilbury on the Thames, and the

queen talked of appearing at their head, and animating them in battle by her presence. To this proposal Leicester objected. "As for your person," he wrote to her, "being the most dainty and sacred thing we have in this world to care for, I cannot, most dear queen, consent that you should expose it to danger; for upon your well-doing consists all the safety of your whole kingdom; and, therefore, preserve that above all. Yet will I not, that in some sort so princely and rare a magnanimity should not appear to your people and to the world as it is." He then recommends her merely to visit the camp and fort for a few days. With this advice she complied; and Leicester now appeared in her view without a rival. To reward his transcendent merit, a new and unprecedented office was created, which would have conferred on him an authority almost equal to that of his sovereign. He was appointed lord-lieutenant of England and Ireland. The warrant was prepared for the royal signature, when the unexpected death of the favourite put an end to all such distinctions. On the queen's departure from Tilbury, Leicester had disbanded the army, and set out for his castle at Kenilworth; but at Cornbury-park in Oxfordshire, his progress was arrested by a violent disease, which, whether it arose from natural causes, or the anguish of disappointed ambition, (Burleigh and Hatton having remonstrated with the queen on the subject of the earl's promotion,) or from poison administered by his wife and her supposed paramour, speedily terminated his life, September 4th, 1588. The queen shed many tears for the loss of her favourite, but at the same time took care of her exchequer, by ordering the public sale of his goods for the payment of certain sums which he owed to the revenue.

Leicester possessed in his youth those personal attractions which, in the court of Elizabeth, were essential to prosperity. By the spirit of his conversation, the warmth of his flattery, and the expense of his entertainments, he maintained his ascendancy over the queen for the long period of thirty years. As a statesman or commander, he displayed but little ability. His rapacity and ambition were unbounded. His sanction of the reformed religion and the style of his correspondence, would lead us to think he was a man of superior piety, but the course of his life seems entirely to contradict such a character. In the year 1584, the history of his life was published in a tract, which was known by the name of 'Leicester's Commonwealth.' This book contained so much to the prejudice of the earl, that his nephew, Sir Philip Sydney, undertook to answer it; but he does not appear to have disproved its most important statements. The work was attributed to Persons, the Jesuit.

Sir Humphrey Gilbert.

BORN A. D. 1539.—DIED A. D. 1583.

SIR HUMPHREY GILBERT, a uterine brother of Sir Walter Raleigh, and, like him, one of the many enterprising men who adorned the age of Elizabeth, was born in 1539, of an ancient Devonshire family. His mother, when she became a widow, married Mr Raleigh; of this marriage, Sir Walter was the offspring. Humphrey, though a second

son, inherited considerable fortunes. After going through the usual course of studies at Eton, he went to Oxford; but as he is not mentioned in Wood's 'Athenæ Oxonienses,' it is not probable that he remained there long. As he was intended for the law, he was to finish his studies at the Temple. Humphrey, however, was by nature much more fit for a life of enterprize than of study,—for the court or the camp, rather than the cloister or the bar. When quite young, his aunt, Mrs Catherine Astley, who was in the queen's service, introduced him at court. There, in the presence of the maiden queen, he imbibed all those chivalrous feelings, that devoted loyalty, and that love of enterprize and distinction, which characterised so many of the gallant courtiers of that age. He immediately embraced a soldier's life; and having distinguished himself in several expeditions, particularly in that to Havre in 1563, he was sent to Ireland to suppress a rebellion, of which James Fitzmorris was the principal instigator. For his important services on this occasion, he was raised to the chief command in the county of Munster. He, at the same time, received the honour of knighthood at the hands of Sir H. Sydney, in January, 1570. Prince tells us that it was conferred by Queen Elizabeth in 1577; but this is a mistake. On his return to England, he was fortunate enough to marry an heiress. In 1571, he was chosen member of parliament for Plymouth. His conduct on this occasion was more loyal than popular. He excited the indignant reproofs of Mr Wentworth for maintaining the propriety of curbing that boldness of speech, which, as he pretended, was fraught with danger at once to the "liberty of the subject and to the queen's prerogative." At that period, the 'liberty of the subject' was put in little peril from such a cause, however ominously it might look for the royal prerogative. Mr Wentworth was almost the only man of his age who dared to speak like a free man, and no wonder that his plainness of speech offended the ears of the refined and loyal courtier.

In 1572, Sir Humphrey sailed with some forces to the aid of Colonel Morgan in Flanders. His enterprizing genius, stimulated by travel and adventure, now dwelt with enthusiasm on those various schemes for improving navigation and extending discovery and commerce, which formed the day-dreams of so many adventurous spirits of the age, but which, though they often ended in nothing but disappointment, sometimes led to brilliant results. In 1576, he published a book, entitled, 'A Discourse to prove a Passage by the North-west to Catheria and the East Indies.' This discourse is preserved in Hakluyt's voyages. It is a work of considerable merit, and displays not only extensive reading, but no inconsiderable measure of scientific knowledge. Sir Humphrey even lived to attempt the realization of his hypothesis; but the very year in which his book appeared, the well-known Frobisher sailed, probably in consequence of it. In the meantime, Sir Humphrey's energies were employed on another project. This was the more complete discovery of the northern coast of America. In 1578, he obtained from Elizabeth a patent, empowering him to take possession of any lands he might discover, or which had been, as yet, unappropriated. He could not persuade others, however, to join in the enterprize with enthusiasm equal to his own, and it was with considerable difficulty that he obtained a sufficient number to complete the expedition.

At length he effected his object, in what way we know not; and sailed to Newfoundland. He soon returned without having accomplished any thing by his voyage. Not discouraged by this ill-success, he put to sea again in 1583, with five ships, and his half-brother, Raleigh, was his companion in this expedition. The largest vessel was compelled to put back, a virulent disease having broken out on board. August 3d, Sir Humphrey disembarked at Newfoundland, and, two days after his arrival, took formal possession of the harbour of St John's. He immediately availed himself of the queen's patent, and parcelled out considerable portions of the new territory to such of his followers as chose to take them. None of them thought it prudent to brave the horrors of that inhospitable region at that time. But as several of them returned and settled on their new possessions, Sir Humphrey is undoubtedly entitled to the honour of being considered the founder of this portion of our American possessions. This was not the great object, however, with which either Sir Humphrey Gilbert or any of the other enterprising navigators of that day fitted out their expeditions, and sought, amidst so much peril, the unknown regions of the west. Their immediate object was GOLD. The discovery of America has, it is true, incalculably enriched Europe, but not in the way Columbus and his successors imagined. To them, the vast tracts of fertile country, and the encouragement to be afforded to navigation and commerce, were as nothing. It was what was beneath the surface that they sought; all else was comparatively worthless. The success of sordid, avaricious Spain, had stimulated the cupidity of all the other European nations, and no adventurer left the ports of England who did not dream of Eldorado and the sudden acquisition of boundless wealth. In conformity with the spirit of the age, Sir Humphrey had taken out with him a Saxon miner. He soon professed to have discovered a rich silver mine on the coast. To convince Sir Humphrey, he showed some ore which he had dug up. Elated with hopes of his success, Sir Humphrey said he did not doubt of being able to obtain from Elizabeth ten thousand pounds for another and larger expedition the next year, knowing that he was secure of his mistress's smiles, if he did but gratify her avarice. These hopes, however, were soon most painfully dissipated. His largest vessel was lost in a storm; his miner perished with her, and only twelve of the crew were saved. On the 20th of August, he embarked in a small sloop, for the purpose of exploring the coast. Soon after he steered homeward, but could not be persuaded to desert the little vessel in which he had faced so many dangers. On the 9th of September, when the bark was labouring in a most tempestuous sea, he was seen by the crew of his remaining ship, sitting with a book in his hand in the stern of the vessel, and was heard to exclaim, "Courage, my lads! we are as near heaven at sea as on land." About midnight she foundered; and the gallant Sir Humphrey and his crew perished.

We have already spoken of his character. At the close of the treatise to which we have already referred, mention is made of another 'On Navigation,' which he intended to publish. It is now in all probability lost. He well deserves a name amongst the benefactors of his country, since the important colony of Newfoundland, whose fisheries have been so valuable to us, owes its establishment to his enterprise.

Sir Francis Walsingham.

DIED A. D. 1590.

SIR FRANCIS WALSHINGHAM was born in the early part of the sixteenth century, at Chislehurst in Kent, of an ancient and honourable family from Walsingham in Norfolk. His education was first conducted by a domestic tutor in his father's house, and at a suitable age he was entered at King's college, Cambridge. After passing the usual period at college, and completing his education, he took an extensive tour among foreign nations. During the reign of Queen Mary, he continued to reside abroad, to prosecute his studies, and to make himself acquainted with every thing in the policy of foreign nations which might fit him to be serviceable to his own country. He became distinguished for his knowledge of the learned languages, as well as those of modern Europe; but more especially for the skilful and eloquent use he made of his own. Soon after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, he returned to his native country, rich in all those accomplishments which might fit him to occupy a distinguished station in the court of that high-minded princess. His talents for business soon recommended him to the queen's secretary, Cecil, who gave him his first employment as an ambassador to the court of France, during one of the most interesting and turbulent periods of its history. Distinguished as he was, however, by sagacity and caution, he was deceived by the execrable Charles the Ninth and his mother, and gained no foresight of those cruel and infernal plots which issued in the horrible massacre of St Bartholomew. He continued in this post till the year 1573, discharging his duties with exemplary fidelity, diligence and caution. His prudence and skill procured him the praise of Wicquefort, the distinguished critic of diplomacy, though it may be thought that he carried the arts of subtlety and deception somewhat beyond the bounds of honour and truth. Dr Lloyd says, "his head was so strong, that he could look into the depths of men and business, and dive into the whirlpools of state. Dexterous he was in finding a secret, close in keeping it. His conversation was insinuating and reserved; he saw every man, and none saw him. He would say, he must observe the joints and flexures of affairs; and so do more with a story, than others could with an harangue. He always surprised business, and preferred motions in the heat of other diversions; and if he must debate it, he would hear all. The Spanish proverb was familiar with him, 'Tell a lie, and find a truth;' and this, 'Speak no more than you may safely retreat from without danger, or fairly go through with without opposition.'" Upon his return he stood high in the queen's favour, and in 1573, was sworn of the privy council, endowed with the honour of knighthood, and appointed one of the principal secretaries of state. One of his chief engagements consisted in watching, detecting, and defeating all plots against the queen's person and government. Few ministers of state were ever so well-qualified for this office, or ever discharged it with more ability and success. He employed a great number of agents as spies both at home and abroad. The Jesuits were the principal party whom he had to watch. He overmatched them with

their own weapons, drawing out and detecting all their machinations while he seemed to be the dupe of them. He made himself acquainted with all letters which passed between the enemies of the government, without breaking their seals, or seeming even to know of their existence. He practised with great success the art of weaving plots in which the seditious were effectually entangled. Sometimes he would allow a plot to proceed for many years together, admitting treasonable conspirators to a high degree of familiarity both with himself and the queen, until their guilt was ripe for detection, when he either spared them upon an humble submission, or made them examples and warnings unto others.

In the year 1581, he was employed by the queen in the delicate and difficult affair of negotiating a marriage for her with the duke of Anjou. But after the exercise of all his patience and all his diplomatic subtlety, he had the mortification of seeing his efforts frustrated by her royal coquetry. Upon his return he was despatched to the court of Scotland for the purpose of informing his mistress of the young king's character and abilities. Walsingham was admitted to much familiar intercourse with him, and formed a very favourable opinion of his capacity for government. Soon after this embassy, his aptness at detecting plots against the queen's person was called into exercise by the Babington conspiracy. As soon as he had gained information of the existence of such a plot, his next step was effectually to entangle the conspirators. He engaged spies, who insinuated themselves into the confidence of the acting parties. He then became master of all their proceedings, and chose his own opportunity for seizing their persons. This plot produced much alarm throughout the kingdom, and was the means of sealing the fate of Mary, queen of Scots.¹ The queen, upon her trial, intimated that Walsingham had probably forged some of the letters produced against her; but, on hearing it, Walsingham rose, and most solemnly disavowed the charge, and in so convincing a manner, that the queen offered an apology to him for having indulged such a suspicion. Upon the unhappy end of the queen of Scotland, when the resentment of her son, and of Scotland generally, broke out against Elizabeth and the English nation, Walsingham penned a wise and interesting letter to Lord Thirlestone, James's secretary, showing by many irresistible arguments, the impolicy of fomenting the enmity of the two nations against each other, and the unfavourable influence it must have upon the king of Scotland's eventual succession to the English throne. In short, he proved, that to make such a breach must inevitably create an impassable gulph between the king and the highest object of his own and of the nation's hopes. This letter was attended with the desired effect: an amicable intercourse was soon after restored between the courts, and all idea of hostile measures on the part of James abandoned.

Walsingham was heartily attached to the protestant cause, and endeavoured to remove the church of England as far as possible from

¹ Walsingham has been charged with the guilt of endeavouring to effect the murder of that unfortunate princess privately. The authority on which he has been so charged is a letter addressed by him to Sir Amias Poulet, and signed by himself and Davidson. But there are reasons to suspect the genuineness of that letter, and Walsingham is, moreover, well known to have strenuously opposed so infamous an act when it was proposed by the earl of Leicester.

popery. He believed religion to be the highest interest of his country, and to its promotion he devoted his heart, his head, and his purse. He has the honour of having sustained and cemented the protestant cause in times of its greatest peril, and of having effectually ruined the interests of popery by detecting and baffling all its plots. His firm attachment to protestantism inclined him to favour and countenance the puritans, on account of their zeal against popery, when the queen and others about the court would have employed the harshest measures against them.

In 1586, he founded a divinity lecture at Oxford, the object of which was to discuss the principal doctrines of Christianity as taught in the sacred Scriptures, and opposed by the church of Rome. This lecture he endowed with the revenue of some lands granted to him by the queen, from the vacant see of Oxford. Lloyd says, "he first observed the great bishop of Winchester fit to serve the church, upon the unlikely youth's first sermon at Allhallows, Barking. He brought the Lord Cooke first to the church upon some private discourse with him at his table. He could as well fit King James's humour with sayings out of Xenophon. Thucydides, Pinitarch, Tacitus, as he could King Henry's with Rabelais's conceits, and the Hollander with mechanic discourses. In a word, Sir Francis Walsingham was a studious and temperate man; so public-spirited, that he spent his estate to serve the kingdom; so faithful, that he bestowed his years on his queen; so learned, that he provided a library for King's college of his own books, which was the best for policy, as Cecil's was for history, Arundel's for heraldry, Cotton's for antiquities, and Usher's for divinity. Finally, he equalled all the statesmen former ages discoursed of, and hardly hath been equalled by any in following ages."

In his advanced age, he retired from the active duties of public life, and enjoyed the learned, quiet, and calm repose of his country residence. In 1589, he entertained Queen Elizabeth at Barn Elms. Before this period, however, he had felt the infirmities of advancing age, and withdrew to that retirement which so well-befitted him after the long and busy life he had passed in courts and cabinets. He died, April, 1590, but so much in debt, that it was found desirable to bury him by night in St Paul's, lest his body should be arrested. As it is well-known that he was far from extravagance and luxury in his mode of living, his debts must be ascribed to his zeal in the public cause, and possibly to the entertainment he had given the queen only a year before his death. The system of espionage which he found it prudent or even necessary to keep up was most probably at his own expense; for, in that frugal age, patriotism and public service were often left to reward themselves, or to feed upon the magnanimity out of which they sprang.

He left behind an only daughter, who was successively married to Sir Philip Sidney, the earl of Essex, and the earl of Clanricarde, by all of whom she had children. A work, entitled, '*Arcana Aulica, or Walsingham's Manual of Prudential Maxims for the Statesman and Courtier,*' has been ascribed to him, but its authenticity has never been established. His despatches and negotiations during his residence at the court of France, were collected and published in folio, in 1655, by Sir Dudley Digges.

Sir Christopher Hatton.

DIED A. D. 1591.

THIS minister of Queen Elizabeth was the youngest son of William Hatton, of Holdenby, Hants. He entered at St Mary hall, Oxford, and thereafter at the Inner Temple. During his residence at the latter, he appeared at court. At a masque, where he danced in presence of Elizabeth, he attracted her attention by his figure and performance; and from this occasion we have to date his course of political advancement, which, however, appears to have failed of putting a final termination to his exhibitions in the dance. He became a queen's pensioner, and thereafter was created successively, gentleman of the privy-chamber, captain of the guard, vice-chamberlain, and privy-councillor. We find him taking an active part, while vice-chamberlain, in the trial of Dr William Parry for high treason, which occurred in 1585. He was not satisfied that judgment should pass immediately on Parry's confession. "These matters," said he, "contained in this indictment, and confessed by this man, are of great importance; they touch the person of the queen's majesty in the highest degree, the very state and well-being of the whole commonwealth, and the truth of God's word established in her majesty's dominions; and they contain the open demonstration of that capital envy of the man of Rome, that hath set himself against God and godliness, all good princes, good governments, and good men. Wherefore, I pray you, for the satisfaction of this great multitude, let the whole truth appear, that every one may see that the matter of itself is as bad as the indictment purporteth, and as the prisoner hath confessed."¹ The court accordingly proceeded with the cause, and the vice-chamberlain took a special part in the examination of the prisoner. This trial afforded him an opportunity of paying the following compliment to the queen:—"It was a wonder to see the magnanimity of her majesty, which, after that thou hadst opened those traiterous practices in sort as thou hast laid it down in thy confession, was, nevertheless, such, and so far from all fear, as that she would not so much as acquaint any one of her highness's privy-council with it, to my knowledge; no, not until after this thy enterprise discovered and made manifest. And besides that which thou hast set down under thine own hand, thou didst confess that thou hadst prepared two Scottish daggers, fit for such a purpose; and those being disposed away by thee, thou didst say that another would serve thy turn. And, withal, Parry, didst thou not also confess before us, how wonderfully thou wert appalled and perplexed upon a sudden, at the presence of her majesty at Hampton-court, this last summer, saying, that thou didst think thou then sawest in her the very likeness and image of King Henry VIII?"²

Whether Hatton's professed admiration of Elizabeth materially influenced his farther elevation may be but matter of conjecture—but, in 1587, on the death of Bromley, he was raised to the office of lord-chancellor. In his course of aggrandisement, he had been subjected, as

¹ Criminal Trials, (*Library of Entertaining Knowledge*,) vol. i. p. 254.

² Ibid. p. 268.

may well be supposed, to hostility at court. It is recorded of Leicester, Elizabeth's unworthy favourite, that, when Sir Christopher was ill, and the queen paid him a daily visit, the earl endeavoured to supplant the man on whom she was showering such condescending kindness, in favour of Edward Dyer, who had given offence at court. Even Hatton's appointment to the chancellorship has been represented as a scheme supported by his enemies in order to involve him in disgrace; and it is stated, that, at first, the sergeants refused to plead at his bar. There seems reason, indeed, to suppose that he had but imperfectly studied law, and this deficiency might appear to us sufficient of itself to have disqualified him for the high and responsible office of lord-chancellor, did we not attend to a distinction between its present functions and those which, it is probable, belonged to it then. Miss Aiken remarks,³ "It was only since the reformation that this great office had begun to be filled by common-law lawyers: before this period it was usually exercised by some ecclesiastic who was also a civilian; and instances were not rare of the seals having been held in commission by noblemen during considerable intervals:—facts which, in justice to Hatton and to Elizabeth, ought, on this occasion, to be kept in mind." Indeed, the office seems anciently to have been one of *equity*, rather in the sense of *absolute justice*, than in that of right, as determined by legal rules or manifold precedents.⁴

Prudence and good sense may go far to conquer difficulties that might seem to require far higher faculties to overcome them. Hatton took two sergeants to advise him in cases that came before him, and he gave public satisfaction as lord-chancellor, although it seems that, at first, on the queen's expressing dissatisfaction with her own nomination, he offered to resign. Another mark of royal favour for Sir Christopher is a letter to the bishop of Ely, already quoted in the 'Life of Elizabeth,' in which she calls on the prelate to stand by an agreement he had made. The engagement referred to was the giving up a garden and orchard connected with Ely-house, in the neighbourhood of Holborn. On the prelate refusing, Hatton prosecuted him in chancery, gained his suit, and built on the place a magnificent house encompassed with gardens, the memorial of which many of our readers may recognise in that part of London known by the name of Hatton-Garden. That the chancellor was somewhat covetous of property belonging, or supposed to belong, to the church, seems not unlikely, from a similar incident recorded of him by Sir John Harrington.⁵ Yet he appears to have been a moderate, prudent, and sensible man. He supported the church of England, and discouraged the Puritans, but was opposed to the rigid enforcement of certain statutes lately passed against the Roman Catholics. He was also a man of

³ Court of Elizabeth, vol. ii. p. 205.

⁴ Equity, in the acceptation in which that word is used in English jurisprudence," says Sir J. Mackintosh," (*Life of Sir T. More*) "is no longer to be confounded with that *moral equity* which generally corrects the unjust operation of law, and with which it seems to have been synonymous in the days of Selden and Bacon." In conformity with this view, it may be remarked, that we do not observe *legal knowledge* to be represented by the duke of Norfolk, as one of More's qualifications for the office of lord-chancellor, in the eloquent speech which he delivered at Sir Thomas's instalment, as given in the life of that eminent man, by More and Mackintosh.

⁵ Brief View of the Church of England.

some literary attainments. Warton supposes him to have written part of a drama, composed by five students of the Inner Temple, entitled 'Tancred and Sigismunda,'⁶ of which the fourth act has this inscription at the end—*Composuit Ch. Hat.*—and, from the circumstance that part of the queen's translation of a tragedy, preserved in MSS. in the Bodleian library, at Oxford, is in his autograph, a female biographer of Elizabeth⁷ infers, that he probably assisted her in her literary pursuits. He has also been supposed to be the author of 'A treatise concerning Statutes or Acts of Parliament, and the expression thereof.' For two or three years before his death, he was vice-chancellor of Oxford, where he did much for the improvement of the university. He died in 1591, after a considerably protracted illness. His death was attributed to a broken heart, occasioned by the queen's severity in demanding certain sums received by him as tithes and first-fruits, which he was unable to pay. Whether there is truth in this explanation of his death it seems impossible to ascertain with certainty; but the queen paid him great attention in his illness, and remitted to his heir, her claims against the chancellor's estate.

Sir John Perrot.

DIED A. D. 1592.

COMMON report, as well as personal resemblance, gave Sir John Perrot, sometime deputy of Ireland, Henry VIII. for a father. Whether the popular rumour was correct or not in this instance, Sir John resembled his alleged parent in some other points besides those merely external; his temper was as haughty and violent, and his language equally coarse and abusive. The family from which he derived his name and property was settled at Haroldtone in Pembrokeshire. In 1572, Sir John greatly distinguished himself against the Munster rebels; and, as lord-deputy of Ireland, some years after, he exhibited a policy at once humane and prudent, in checking as much as possible the tyranny which the English settlers exercised towards the natives of that country, and extending his protection to the natives. His proposal to apply the revenues of St Patrick's cathedral to the purposes of general education in Ireland raised the clergy against him, and by means of forged documents his enemies succeeded in representing him to Elizabeth as a man of deep and dangerous enterprises, who aimed at nothing less than securing the sovereignty of Ireland for himself. His own hasty and rash temper lent considerable support to their representatives; and at length in 1592, he was put upon his trial for high treason. The heads of the indictment were: his contemptuous language respecting the queen,—his secret encouragement of the Spanish invasion,—and generally his favouring of traitors. Of the first only of these charges could he be proved guilty with any show of reason and justice, but an obsequious jury found him guilty of all. On leaving the bar, he is reported to have exclaimed, "God's death! will the queen suffer her

⁶ This drama is given in Dodsley's *Old Plays*, 2d edit.

⁷ Miss Aiken, *Court of Elizabeth*, vol. ii. p. 288.

brother to be sacrificed to the envy of his gossiping adversaries?" The queen seems to have felt the force of the appeal, and delayed the issuing of the warrant for his execution. But in September, 1592, this victim of malice perished in the Tower under the joint influence of a broken heart and constitution.

Sir John Hawkins.

BORN A. D. 1520.—DIED A. D. 1595.

THIS renowned naval commander was born at Plymouth about the year 1520. He was descended of a respectable family in Devonshire, and was the son of Captain William Hawkins. Young John was early introduced to a seafaring life, and evinced an ardent attachment to it. His youth was spent principally in voyages to Spain and Portugal and the Canary islands. These voyages were mainly devoted to commercial purposes, and designed to extend the trade of England. By the experience thereby gained, Hawkins became qualified for more enlarged plans and bolder enterprizes. Unhappily, however, these plans were not always projected with a due respect for honour and justice. In 1562, he led the way in the lucrative but infamous traffic in slaves. Having induced some English merchants to embark with him in this enterprize, he fitted out several vessels, with which he repaired to the coast of Guinea. There he contrived, partly by purchase and partly by violence, to obtain a cargo of human beings to the amount of three hundred, which he took immediately to Hispaniola and disposed of in an unlawful traffic. Success and extensive gains made him still bolder and more rapacious. In 1564, he returned to the Guinea coast with a larger force of men and shipping. Carrying on his kidnapping enterprize to greater extent, he lost some of his men, but still obtained a large number of Negroes, for which he again found a ready market, and obtained a high price. Those brutal proceedings, instead of kindling the indignation of his countrymen, rather conduced to spread abroad his fame, and to draw the admiring eyes of the world upon the bold and successful commander who had thus shown a new and speedy way to riches.¹ In 1567, he proceeded upon a third expedition, having under his command two of the queen's ships and four of private owners. Having obtained by purchase and violence four hundred slaves, he proceeded to Spanish America, but on his arrival at Rio de la Flacha, the governor refused to have any traffic with him. Without farther ceremony he landed and took the town, and was thereby enabled to dispose of his Negroes to the inhabitants. At this period the Spaniards were at peace with England, but disputed the right of free trade which England claimed. Hawkins, however, asserted the rights of his country with great vigour and spirit. From this port he sailed to Carthagená, and there disposed of the remainder of his slaves, but on his voyage back was overtaken by a

¹ It will appear in the present age a singular proof of the barbarism of those times, that even an armorial distinction should be sought for the man who brought so foul a blot on the escutcheon of his country. A crest of arms was granted him by patent, consisting of a demy-moor in his proper colour, bound with a cord—a fit and worthy symbol of the inhuman feats which had emblazoned the name of Hawkins.

storm in the bay of Mexico, and driven into the harbour of St Juan de Ulloa. He entered this harbour without soliciting permission to do so, and it was recorded at the time as an instance of generous forbearance, that he did not seize twelve rich merchantmen then in the harbour, but contented himself with taking hostages for the supply of whatever he might want. While Hawkins was refitting in this harbour, a fleet of Spaniards appeared, which was suffered to enter the harbour after a negotiation. The Spanish viceroy gave assurances of friendship to the English commander, but it was only to secure time, and make preparations for an attack. As soon as Hawkins perceived his situation he determined to fight with the greatest obstinacy. His force was greatly inferior and quite unfit to cope with the Spaniards. The result was deeply disastrous to the English squadron. Hawkins, after a terrible conflict, was obliged to seek safety by flight. With one ship and a bark he made sail, but was obliged through inadequate provision, to put half his men on shore, in a creek of the bay. He then made the best of his way for England, and after enduring great hardships reached it in January, 1568.

From this period his ardour for naval enterprizes appears to have subsided. He quietly applied himself to the service of his country in the office of treasurer of the navy, to which he was appointed in 1573. There were several younger men and officers of great merit who had been bred under himself, and among these, none more justly renowned than his kinsman Drake. Soon after this appointment, he was very near losing his life through being mistaken by an assassin for the vice-chamberlain Hatton. For some years Hawkins continued to advise and direct the naval enterprizes, though he took no direct part in their execution; but in 1588, when the naval power of Spain was brought against England in the formidable and splendid armada, Hawkins of course, as an experienced and brave commander, was called forth to action. He had the commission of rear-admiral on that memorable occasion, and commanded the Victory. He subsequently received the honour of knighthood and the flattering commendations of the queen for his conduct on that emergency. In 1590, two squadrons of ships were sent out to infest the Spanish coast, and interrupt their fleet which was expected with treasure from the new world. One of these squadrons was put under his command; the other under Sir Martin Frobisher. This cruize however failed in its main objects, though it greatly distressed Spain, and contributed to the maintenance of our naval superiority. Hawkin's last enterprize was in conjunction with Drake against the West Indies. The commanders quarrelled, the enterprize failed, and Hawkins falling ill through vexation, and probably through the wound his pride had received in being obliged to submit to Drake, died before any thing had been effected, on the 21st of November, 1595. He had been twice returned member of parliament for his native place, Plymouth. He founded an hospital at Chatham, for poor and infirm and sick sailors. He was admitted to be an able and judicious officer; and though his fame is sullied by the part he took in establishing the slave-trade, yet he contributed greatly to establish the maritime reputation of his country. He was highly esteemed for his thorough knowledge of every branch of naval affairs. His courage was rather cool than enterprising, rather firm than bold. His manners were rude and harsh, and he was more beloved by his men than by his officers. In

some respects he cannot stand as a true specimen of English naval character—he was both crafty and avaricious.

Sir Francis Drake.

BORN A. D. 1545.—DIED A. D. 1596.

FRANCIS DRAKE, one of the most brilliant names in the naval history of England, was born of obscure parentage, at Tavistock, in Devonshire, in 1545. He was the eldest of twelve sons, all of whom, with few exceptions, went to sea. Francis was early apprenticed to the master of a small vessel that traded to France and the Low Countries, who, dying unmarried, left him his ship in reward of his faithful services. At this time the West Indies had not been long discovered, and little was talked of amongst merchant-seamen but the riches of this new country and the wealth to be got by trading with it. Drake too was dazzled by the prospect of an adventure to the West Indies, and having sold the vessel of which he had so lately become possessed, embarked the proceeds in what was then called the Guinea-trade, and sailed from England in the squadron of Captain John Hawkins. The regular course of this trade was to repair first to the Guinea coast, and, by force, fraud, and other means, procure a cargo of slaves, and then to proceed to the Spanish islands and colonies, where the Africans were exchanged for such commodities as were most marketable at home. Hawkins's squadron having completed their cargo of slaves sailed for Spanish America, and entered the port of St Juan de Ulloa, in the gulf of Mexico, where they were treacherously attacked by the Spanish fleet, as related in a preceding notice, and four of their vessels destroyed. The *Minion*, with Hawkins himself on board, and the *Judith*, commanded by Drake, were the only English ships that escaped on this occasion.

Drake lost his whole property in this unfortunate adventure, but, though oppressed and impoverished, he retained at least his courage and his industry; and, with that ardent spirit which prompted him to, and bore him through, so many adventures, he instantly projected and executed a new voyage to America, with the view of gaining accurate intelligence of the state of the Spanish settlements in that quarter, preparatory to a grand expedition against them. This first experimental voyage took place in 1570; but Drake's first attempt at reprisal upon a large scale was made in 1572. On the 24th of May, that year, he sailed from Plymouth in the *Pasha*, of 70 tons, accompanied by the *Swan*, of 25 tons; the latter vessel being placed under the command of his brother John. The whole force with which Drake set out on this occasion, to make reprisals upon the most powerful nation in the world, consisted of these two light vessels, slightly armed, and supplied with a year's provisions, and 73 men and boys. He, probably, however, increased his force during the cruise, and we know that he was joined before his attack on *Nombre de Dios*, by one Captain Rause, whose ship was manned by about 50 men. His attack on *Nombre de Dios* failed, but, shortly after, he had the good fortune to capture a string of treasure-mules, on the rout from Panama to that port. It

was during the hurried march which he made across the isthmus, with the view of effecting this capture, that Drake caught his first sight of the Pacific from 'a goodly and great high tree,'—a sight which, to use the words of Camden, "left him no rest in his own mind till he had accomplished his purpose of sailing an English ship in those seas."

After his return to England from this successful expedition, we find Drake acting as a volunteer with three stout frigates, under Essex, in subduing the Irish rebellion. His services on this occasion enabled Sir Christopher Hatton to present him with many recommendations to Queen Elizabeth, who, pleased with the young mariner's appearance and account of himself, promised him her patronage and assistance for the future. Drake now announced his scheme of a voyage into the south seas, through the straits of Magellan, and Elizabeth secretly encouraged his design. It was of importance to conceal the matter from the Spaniards. The squadron, therefore, which Drake collected for his new expedition was ostensibly fitted out for a trading voyage to Alexandria. It consisted of five small vessels, the largest, called the *Pelican*, being only 500 tons, and the aggregate crew only 164 men. A violent gale forced them back, soon after quitting port, and did considerable damage to the little squadron; but, on the 13th of December, 1577, they again put to sea, and, on the 20th of May, 1578, the squadron anchored in the Port St Julian of Magellan, in 40° 30' south latitude. "Here," says one relation, "we found the gibbet still standing on the main where Magellan did execute justice upon some of his rebellious and discontented company." Whether Drake took the hint thus suggested from his predecessor or not, he embraced the opportunity afforded him during the stay of the fleet at this place to bring one of the partners of his expedition to trial on a charge of conspiracy and mutiny. The accounts which we possess of this transaction are by no means clear or corroborating. We know, in fact, little more of it than Cliffe has expressed in one brief sentence, "Mr Thomas Doughty was brought to his answer,—accused, convicted, and beheaded." Mr Francis Fletcher, the chaplain of the fleet, states that Drake took the sacrament with Doughty after his condemnation, and that they then dined together "at the same table, as cheerfully in sobriety as ever in their lives they had done; and, taking their leaves, by drinking to each other, as if some short journey only had been in hand." Early in September, the squadron emerged from the western end of the straits, having spent about fifteen days in their navigation, and, on the 6th of the same month, Drake enjoyed the long prayed-for felicity of sailing an English ship on the South sea. On clearing the straits, the fleet held a north-west course, but was immediately driven by a violent gale into 57° south latitude, soon after which the *Marigold* parted company, and was never heard of more. To complete their disasters, the *Golden Hind*, in which Drake himself now sailed, while anchored in a bay near the entrance of the straits, broke her cable and drove to sea. The *Elizabeth*, her companion, commanded by Captain Winter, immediately returned through the straits, and reached England in June, 1578. But the *Hind*, being beaten round without the strait, touched at Cape Horn, from which place Drake sailed along the coast to Valparaiso, nigh to which latter place he had the good fortune to fall in with and capture a valuable Spanish ship, in which were found 60,000 pesos of

gold, and 1770 jars of Chili wine. A richer prize soon after fell into his hands: this was the *Cacafuego* having on board 26 tons of silver, 13 chests of plate, and 80 lbs. of gold. Drake now began to think of returning home, but, as the attempt to repass the straits would have exposed him to the certainty of capture by the despoiled Spaniards, he resolved on seeking a north-west passage homewards, and, with this resolution, steered for Nicaragua. In this attempt, he reached the 48th northern parallel on the western coast of America, but, despairing of success, and the season being now far advanced, he steered westwards from this point for the cape of Good Hope, and, on the 16th of October, made the Philippines. After narrowly escaping shipwreck on the coast of Celebes, in $1^{\circ} 56'$ south latitude, they made sail for Java, which they reached on the 12th of March, and, on the 15th of June, they reached the cape of Good Hope, which, to their great surprise, they doubled with comparative ease and safety,—a circumstance from which they concluded “the report of the Portugals most false,” which had represented the doubling of the cape as a thing of exceeding danger and difficulty. On the 25th of September, 1580, Captain Drake came to anchor in the harbour of Plymouth, having completed the circumnavigation of the globe in two years and ten months. The fame of his exploit, and of the immense booty which he had captured, soon rung throughout all England, and, on the 4th of April, 1581, Queen Elizabeth rewarded the intrepid navigator by dining in state on board the *Hind*, and conferring upon its commander the honour of knighthood. The Spanish court was loud in its complaints against Drake, and solemnly protested against the right of the English to navigate the South sea; but Elizabeth treated its remonstrances with scorn, and a war betwixt the two nations ensued forthwith.

In 1585, Sir Francis sailed, with an armament of twenty-five sail, to the West Indies, and captured the cities of St Jago, St Domingo, and Carthagena. His vice-admiral in this expedition was the celebrated Martin Frobisher. His next exploit was an attack upon the shipping of Cadiz, which was to have made part of the armada. In this service he was completely successful, having burnt upwards of 10,000 tons of shipping in that harbour. A more lucrative, if less splendid, achievement, was the capture of the *St Philip*, a Portuguese carrack from the West Indies, with an immense treasure on board. In the following year, he was appointed vice-admiral under Howard, high-admiral of England, and acquitted himself most nobly and successfully in the ever-memorable fight with the armada. In 1595, Sir Francis was, for a short time, associated with Sir John Hawkins, in an expedition against the West Indies, the details of which have already been given in our notice of the latter commander. The expedition proved fatal to both its commanders. Within little more than two months after the death of Sir John Hawkins, Admiral Drake expired on board his own ship, off Porto Bello, on the 28th of January, 1596.

Cecil, Lord Burleigh.

BORN A. D. 1520.—DIED A. D. 1598.

WILLIAM CECIL, Lord Burleigh, secretary of state in the reigns of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth, and afterwards lord-high-treasurer of England, was the son of Richard Cecil, Esq. of Burleigh, in the county of Northampton, master of the robes to Henry VIII. His family traced their origin to Robert Sitsilt, who assisted Robert Fitz Hammon in the conquest of Glamorganshire, in 1091. William was born at Bourne in Lincolnshire, on the 13th of September, 1520, and received the first rudiments of education successively at the grammar schools of Grantham and Stamford. In 1535 he was removed to St John's college, Cambridge, where he distinguished himself by close application to his studies. At the early age of sixteen, he delivered a public lecture on the logic of the schools; and before completing his twentieth year, he read prelections on the Greek language.

About the year 1541, he entered of Gray's inn, where he applied himself to the study of the law, and to the cultivation of such habits as were likely to promote his professional eminence. It is recorded of him, that when studying here, he lost all his furniture and books to his companion at the gaming table, but adopted the following device for obtaining restitution of what he could ill afford to spare at the time. He bored a hole in the wall which separated his chambers from those of his associate, and at midnight bellowed through the aperture sundry fearful threats and exhortations to repentance, which so terrified the victorious gambler, that he refunded his winnings, on his knees, next day. "Many other the like merry jests," says his old biographer, "I have heard him tell, too long to be here noted." An incident, trivial in itself, proved the means of introducing him to the notice of his sovereign. Having gone to visit his father in his apartments at court, he met with two of O'Neil the Irish chieftain's chaplains, in the presence chamber, with whom he got into a warm dispute on various points of faith, and particularly on the pope's supremacy. The argument was conducted in Latin, but the youthful advocate for the reformed religion completely foiled his priestly opponents. This incident having been related to the king, he desired to see young Cecil, and was so pleased with his demeanour and conversation, that he directed his master of the robes to provide his son with a place at court. As no suitable situation happened to be vacant at the time, his father solicited for him the reversion of the Custos Brevium in the court of common pleas, which was readily granted. Shortly after this auspicious introduction at court, Cecil married Mary, the daughter of Sir John Cheke, a gentleman of great respectability and influence, who introduced him to the notice of the earl of Hertford, maternal uncle to the young prince Edward. His first wife having died in 1543, he now married a daughter of Sir Anthony Cooke, the director of the young king's studies, with whom he received a considerable fortune, which, in addition to the revenue of the office of Custos, to which he had now succeeded, placed him in comparative affluence. In 1547, he was appointed to the office of master of requests by the protector, Somerset; and in the same year,

he accompanied his patron into Scotland, and was present at the battle of Pinkie. In 1548, he was promoted to the high office of secretary of state. The fall of his patron—which took place in little more than a year after this—involved Cecil, who was committed to the Tower, where he remained for about the space of three months, when, through the intercession of the duke of Northumberland, he was not only set at liberty, but restored to his office of secretary, knighted, and sworn of the privy council. Cecil played his part in the complicated politics of the day with great prudence and dexterity. He has been accused of ingratitude towards his former patron, Somerset, and of having promoted the ruin of that unfortunate nobleman; but the charge is supported only by negative proofs. We have no evidence that he interfered to preserve Somerset; but we have as little that his interference would have been of any service in the case. It was to the honour of the young secretary, that whilst all the other courtiers were involved in the factions and intrigues of the day, he alone kept aloof from cabals, and applied himself with unremitting attention to the duties of his office. In 1553, Sir William undertook the liquidation of the crown debts, and for this eminent service he was made chancellor of the order of the Garter.

Cecil has been charged with having assisted in drawing up the patent by which the young king, feeling himself dying, consented to fix the succession to the throne in the person of the duchess of Suffolk, to the exclusion of Mary and Elizabeth, daughters of Henry VIII., and Mary, queen of Scots, granddaughter of Henry's eldest sister; but in a memorial which he afterwards drew up touching his conduct in this matter, he declares that he refused to subscribe the patent as a privy-councillor, and had only consented, at the king's earnest entreaty, to subscribe that document as witness to the king's signature. Fuller says, "his hand wrote it as secretary of state, but his heart consented not thereto. Yea, he openly opposed it; though at last, yielding to the greatness of Northumberland, in an age when it was present drowning not to swim with the stream. But," he adds, "Cecil had secret counter endeavours against the strain of the court herein, and privately advanced his rightful intentions against the foresaid duke's ambition." This was undoubtedly the most perilous conjuncture of Cecil's life; but his sagacity and self-command never deserted him, and finally extricated him from the dangers which beset him. On the king's demise, he resolutely refused to draw up the proclamation, declaring Lady Jane Grey's title to the crown; and soon afterwards he contrived to escape from the city and join Queen Mary, who received him very graciously, and would have retained him in her service in the appointment which he had hitherto held, if he would have consented to renounce the protestant faith, which he declined to do; he went to mass however, and for the better ordering of his spiritual concerns took a priest into his house. During the remainder of Mary's reign, he continued in a private station, only attending his duty in parliament, where he sat as one of the members for the county of Lincoln, and conducted himself with considerable boldness, particularly in the debate which ended in the rejection of the bill for confiscating the estates of such as had quitted the kingdom on the score of religion. Yet so guarded was his language, as a parliamentary leader in opposition to the court, that while some

who acted with him were imprisoned by the privy council, he escaped with impunity.

Cecil certainly foresaw that the accession of Elizabeth to the throne was an event not far distant, and with consummate skill he managed to pay his court to that princess without exciting the suspicion of her bigotted sister. When that event happened, Cecil was the first person sworn of Elizabeth's privy-council, and he was at the same time created secretary of state. One of the first measures which he recommended to the attention of the queen, was to meet the spirit of the times by a thorough reformation of the church. He urged upon her consideration the facts, that the nation had expressed itself decidedly in favour of such a step,—that the protestant party confidently looked to her for it,—that she had nothing to hope but much to fear from the catholic party,—and that it became her to vindicate that supremacy in matters ecclesiastical as well as civil which her royal father had so boldly claimed and so highly valued. By such representations he wrung a reluctant consent from Elizabeth to the measures which he proposed; her prejudices, however, frequently resisted her minister's discernment, and it was with the utmost difficulty that Cecil maintained his ground against Parker, Whitgift, and other intolerant prelates. His next care was to remedy the abuses in the coinage which had been greatly debased during the preceding reigns, and the measures which he adopted for this purpose proved so effectual that the money of England soon became the heaviest and finest in Europe. All his financial suggestions were not equally praiseworthy. The plan which he proposed to Elizabeth for augmenting her revenue without having recourse to parliament, is especially to be deprecated. His scheme was to erect a court for the correction of all abuses throughout the kingdom; its officers were to be invested with a kind of inquisitorial authority, and to punish defaulters by fines proportionate to their offences, which were all to be paid into the royal exchequer. Such a measure, if gone into, would have been to revive the practices of Empson and Dudley, and raise a storm of popular opposition which might have hurled even the stern and wary Elizabeth from the throne of England. Cecil was also the author of a scheme for raising a general loan equivalent in amount to a subsidy. A better feature in Cecil's character as a financier was his strict economy. Elizabeth, fortunately for herself and the nation, went along with him in this, and the consequence was that the government during her reign was conducted at less expense, in proportion to the transactions, domestic and foreign, in which it was engaged, than that of any other British sovereign. She also paid the debts with which her father and sister had encumbered the crown, amounting it is supposed to above £4,000,000; and at her death, left the states of Holland her debtors to the amount of £800,000, and France £450,000. Elizabeth, however, had her favourites on whom she occasionally lavished her treasures with a most prodigal hand, such especially was Essex, who, at different times, had received from the queen pecuniary gifts to the extent of £700,000.¹ Then there were the usual host of needy and supplicating courtiers who beset both the queen and her minister on all occasions with their importunities. All this last tribe were treated by Cecil with the contempt they merited,

¹ Nanton's *Regalia*, chap. i.

and he was ever on the alert to harden the queen against their solicitations. He was in consequence often bitterly inveighed against as a parsimonious and narrow-minded minister, and even threatened with the vengeance of the disappointed seekers for wealth or preferment; but, strong in the consciousness of his own rectitude he despised their clamours, and pursued the same maxims with which he had commenced during the whole of his long and successful ministry. But while thus hostile to irregular and unmerited gratuities, Cecil was a punctual and liberal rewarder of real services. It was by his advice that the common soldiers were first clothed at the expense of government, and received their weekly allowances directly into their own hands, instead of, as formerly, through the medium of their officers.

Another task which this indefatigable minister took upon himself, was that of answering all publications hostile to the queen's government. His political writings evince a fair, open, and liberal spirit, and contributed much, it is said, to retain the people in their allegiance, during the frequent partial insurrections which succeeded Norfolk's first conspiracy. The Jesuitical libellers of the day had also their full share of notice from the secretary's pen, as his voluminous apologies still extant testify.²

Cecil was raised to the office of lord-high-treasurer in 1572, being the eleventh year of his administration. Under his management the receipts of the treasury increased rapidly, while the mode of levying the taxes was more equalized, and the general burden made to sit lighter on the people. It was an excellent saying of his, that "he never cared to see the treasury swell like a disordered spleen when the other parts of the constitution were in a consumption." It was an invariable rule of his never to issue the smallest payment without an express order from the queen; and as he never would borrow from the exchequer for his own private purposes, he was almost the only one of Elizabeth's ministers, who, at his death, owed nothing to the public. The same consideration which suggested these economical courses to Elizabeth's great minister, prompted him also to a pacific line of foreign policy. "War," he used to say, "is soon kindled, but peace very hardly procured. War is the curse and peace the blessing of God upon a nation. A realm gains more by one year's peace than by ten years' war." Guided by these maxims he maintained England in a state of tranquillity, while the continental states and Scotland were involved in wars and intestine convulsions. We have already, in different memoirs, adverted to the many difficulties with which Cecil was occasionally called to contend in his system of foreign policy. Surrounded by high and gallant spirits who thirsted for the achievements of the field and the renown of martial enterprize, it was no easy task for him, even aided by his prudent sovereign, to save the nation from being plunged into wars which, however redolent of military glory, would have redounded little to the ultimate welfare and the social security of the country at large. Yet he succeeded in the difficult task, and throughout the struggle which the Low countries maintained with the bigotted Philip, and the civil wars of France, England pursued a line of policy at once pacific and dexterous, which, while it sufficiently vindicated the

² Many of them still remain in manuscript, but Sirype has published several of them.

national honour, effectually prevented a collision betwixt the catholic and protestant parties at home, and, perhaps in the main, proved as beneficial to the oppressed protestant party abroad as the more active and decided interference of England in their behalf could have done. We have dwelt at some length on Elizabeth's policy towards Scotland in other memoirs. It is very difficult to determine how much of Elizabeth's conduct towards the unfortunate Mary was dictated by personal jealousy,—how much by the advice of Cecil and other ministers. Cecil certainly regarded Mary as the most dangerous enemy of his sovereign and the protestant religion, and considered her liberty as incompatible with the safety of either. The partisans of Norfolk also esteemed him the main cause of their leader's death. Elizabeth, with that selfishness which always marked her character, did not hesitate to attempt to shift the odium of both Mary's and Norfolk's execution from herself to Cecil. But still there is no historical evidence of his having laboured to accomplish the death of either of these personages with greater assiduity than his other colleagues in office; and Elizabeth's subsequent conduct sufficiently evinces how unshaken was the confidence she reposed in her favourite minister, notwithstanding all that she affected to believe against him. We have seen how resolutely she interfered to rescue him from Leicester's intrigue for his fall; and on many other occasions she gave evidence that her favourite minister was no more to be impeached by others with impunity than herself. Yet Cecil's rewards were by no means extraordinary. The highest title he ever obtained was that of baron; and his official promotions were always of a kind which brought additional business along with them.

To perform the various duties of the different situations occupied by this statesman required no common talents and no ordinary industry, and nothing was more remarkable in Lord Burleigh than his unremitting diligence. His occupations were manifold, but by steadily adhering to his favourite maxim, that "the shortest way to do many things is to do one thing at once," he got through his duties in a satisfactory manner, without either hurry or confusion. One of his contemporaries has declared that during a period of twenty-four years he never saw him idle for half an hour together. Even when labouring under severe pain from gout, he would make himself be carried to his office for the despatch of business. In his court—like one of our own times whom it is not necessary for us here to name—he is said to have expedited more causes in one term than his predecessors had been accustomed to get through in a twelvemonth; and notwithstanding the multiplicity of business which pressed upon him, no one could ever say of him that he had disregarded a reasonable application for law, justice, or advice in any matter. To have witnessed the minuteness and accuracy of his arrangements for the discharge of his judicial duties, one would have supposed him entirely devoted to these, and to domestic policy; but he was equally indefatigable in foreign affairs,—no plot escaped his vigilance, whether hatched in the Spanish cabinet or in the chamber of the king of France,—the movements of England's enemies were known to him as soon as concerted,—and yet he himself remained impenetrable to the numerous and dexterous spies which surrounded him. There is little doubt that he employed a more extensive system of espionage than is accordant with more modern views of political integrity; but the spirit

and circumstances of the times rendered something of the kind almost indispensable to the minister who desired to be early and accurately informed of the state of parties within his circle of operations.

In his own domestic economy, Burleigh, with all his simple personal habits, was magnificent even to profusion. The state of society at the time demanded this. Yet he not only died unencumbered with debt, but left, besides £11,000 in money, £4,000 a year in lands to his heirs.

Burleigh remained in office for a period almost unexampled in the history of courts. Yet he was by no means avaricious of power, and ambition seems never to have been once awakened in his breast. He aimed at doing his duty in the successive stations to which he was raised without solicitation on his part—and his notions of duty, it must be granted, were of no extraordinary kind—but beyond this he attempted nothing more. He was in fact a lover of retirement, and derived little personal satisfaction from the glitter and bustle of a court. Within a very few years after the accession of Elizabeth, we find him expressing a desire to quit a station in which he enjoyed so little repose; and at different times he solicited the queen with unaffected earnestness to accept of his resignation. But Elizabeth knew his worth too well to part with him easily, and even did not hesitate to descend from the stateliness of royalty, and indulge in such playful familiarities with her minister, as attached him more strongly to her person, and made him for a season abandon his views of retirement.

In private life, Burleigh was simple and domestic. He delighted in the society of his family; and in his wife, the daughter of Sir Anthony Cooke, he possessed during their union of forty-three years, a companion every way fitted to enhance the sweets of domestic life to him. At his own table he was often jocular and sportive, and gave himself up to a moderate but genial hilarity; but conversation, in which he excelled, was the chief pleasure he enjoyed at the festive board, for he ate and drank sparingly. The principal scene of his amusements was his seat at Theobald's near London. Here he used to retire as often as he could snatch an interval of leisure from his public duties, and would amuse and recreate himself by riding up and down the walks on his mule and overlooking the sports of his young retainers; but he never joined in any diversions himself. His piety was unostentatious and sincere; and he used to say that he trusted no man who was not religious, "for he that is false to God can never be true to man."

This able and politic minister died on the 4th of August, 1598, in the 78th year of his age. His royal mistress visited him on his death-bed, and his power passed with little diminution to a son who inherited his abilities. His life has furnished a theme for several pens, and has been recently expanded into three large quarto volumes, by Dr Nares, regius professor of modern history in the university of Oxford.

Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex.

BORN A. D. 1567.—DIED A. D. 1601.

THIS nobleman, whose fortunes are so intimately blended with the military and personal history of Queen Elizabeth, was born at Nether-

wood, Herts, in 1567. His father was Walter, earl of Essex, who had been advanced by that princess to the earldom, and the order of the Garter. His mother was a daughter of Sir Francis Knollys, and a cousin of the queen. The youth, at his father's death, being but ten years of age, his affairs were managed by an agent of Burleigh's of the name of Edward Waterhouse, who, in a letter addressed to Sir Henry Sidney shortly after the death of Essex, represents the son as favoured and supported by the queen and nobles. The earl was educated, under Dr Whitgift, at Trinity college, Cambridge; and, although at an earlier period of his life, he had appeared to be slow in scholarship, he distinguished himself at that university, and took the degree of master of arts in 1582. Leaving college, he retired to a residence at Lambsie, in Wales; but, in 1584, when in the seventeenth year of his age, was introduced at court. Having attended his relative, the earl of Leicester, to Holland, in 1586, he fought at the battle of Zutphen, memorable for the death of Sir Philip Sidney, between whom and a sister of Essex it had been proposed that a marriage should be formed. The young earl distinguished himself upon this occasion, and was created a knight-banneret. In 1587, he succeeded Leicester as master of the horse; and, in the course of the active preparations which were made against Spain, when, in 1588, that country threatened the invasion of England, he was made general of the horse, besides being invested with the order of the garter. On the death of Leicester, in the same year, he became head of the party at court which had been led by that unworthy favourite, of whom he seemed also to prove the successor in the affections of Elizabeth. Of this attachment, his chivalrous character, as well as his beautiful person, may have been in some degree the cause—but, on one occasion, the very ardour of his chivalry seems to have lost him the favour of the queen. For, in 1589, he left the court without her permission, and attached himself to an expedition against Portugal, undertaken by Sir Francis Drake and Sir John Norris—on which she forthwith despatched the earl of Huntingdon with an injunction for his return. But he had sailed from Plymouth before Huntingdon's arrival, and, in ignorance of her wish, or in disobedience to her order, he continued in his enterprise. Having reached Portugal, he served in that country as a volunteer, and, at Lisbon, challenged the governor, or any other of like rank, to single combat. He was commended for his gallantry in this campaign, and received forgiveness of the queen.

The office of Sir Francis Walsingham, principal secretary of state, becoming vacant, by his death in 1590, Essex endeavoured to secure it for Davison, who, by the part he took in the execution of the queen of Scots, had forfeited the royal favour. Lord Burleigh, on the other hand, sought the office for his son, Robert Cecil, and this is given as the first occasion on which decided evidences of mutual opposition between the family of Cecil and the earl appear. It seems probable, however, that real friendship for Davison dictated the exertions which Essex made in his behalf, as recorded in his correspondence with that unfortunate man between the years 1587 and 1590. In his suit to Elizabeth, Essex proved unsuccessful, and, in 1590, he himself fell under her displeasure by privately marrying the widow of Sir Philip Sidney. In the following year, however, when the queen was

engaged in assisting Henry IV. of France against the Spanish power, Essex was sent to Normandy at the head of 4000 men. Contrary to his inclination, he lay for some time at Dieppe, without engaging in military enterprise, but he took a part in the siege of Rouen. On this occasion, he lost, by a musket-shot, a favourite brother, Walter Devereux—‘the half-arch of his house,’ to use his own beautiful expression;¹ and notwithstanding a challenge which he sent to the governor of Rouen, and the display of courage which he gave, he gained, on this expedition, no signal victory. He offended the queen too by the profusion with which he conferred knighthood on the officers. On his return, however, early in 1592, he was favourably received, and was soon afterwards admitted into the privy-council. At court he headed a party in opposition to that of Robert Cecil. This period of his life is marked by one or two circumstances which it might be unjust to overlook; although, considering the political relations in which he stood, it may be impossible to say that his acts of kindness were altogether free from less honourable feelings. In 1592, he endeavoured to procure for Francis Bacon, then a young man, the office of attorney-general; and, afterwards, he sought that of solicitor-general for the same individual—the glory and dishonour of the age. The ‘raw youth,’ as Bacon, on the former of these occasions, was styled by Robert Cecil, was in both cases unsuccessful, the queen recollecting the opposition he had made to her in parliament, how disposed soever she might otherwise have been to gratify her favourite and secure the services of Bacon. Anthony, too, the brother of Francis Bacon, received the patronage of Essex, who furnished him, in 1595, with apartments in Essex-house, as he also presented Francis with an estate. Another circumstance that may be mentioned, is the exposure of a plot against the life of Elizabeth, carried on by Roderigo Lopez, a physician of the queen, who was brought to justice by the persevering exertions of the earl. Sir Robert Cecil informed the queen, that, after inquiry, the charge had not been established, and Elizabeth rebuked the earl for rashness in bringing against a poor man an accusation which he could not make good. But the investigation was renewed, and Lopez, being convicted, suffered execution. In the same year, Essex begged to be appointed commander of the land forces sent out with Sir Francis Drake and Sir John Hawkins, against the Spanish colonies. But the queen declared, that she loved him and her kingdom too well to hazard his safety in such an enterprise, and presented him with £4000.

From court, however, we have now to follow him on another warlike expedition. Lord Howard, of Effingham, joined the earl in urging the queen to renew hostilities with Spain. Elizabeth followed the advice, and, in 1596, Essex was appointed general of the land forces. In Philip of Spain his martial ardour found an enemy congenial to itself, and he is said even to have given Elizabeth offence by his accustomed expression—“I will make that proud king know!” He set out, however, with tokens of her regard, accompanied by Lord Howard of Effingham as lord-admiral. They were attended by a council of war, consisting of Lord Thomas Howard, Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Francis

¹ Apology of the Earl of Essex.

Vere, Sir George Carew, and Sir Conyers Clifford. The fleet sailed on the 1st of June, 1596, and proceeded to Cadiz, where they arrived on the 1st of July. It was proposed, in the first place, to land the troops on shore, and Essex was proceeding to do so, when Raleigh recommended to him that an attack should be made on the vessels lying in the bay. This proposal the enthusiastic spirit of Essex led him to support, and when Raleigh returned, signifying, by the cry of *Entramos*, that the proposal had been acceded to, the earl, in the ardour of his satisfaction, threw his hat into the sea. He was informed, however, that the queen, in her concern for his safety, had given orders that he should not be allowed to lead the van, and he promised to keep himself in a place of greater safety. But this timid policy ill suited the spirit of the earl. On the fleet coming into action with the enemy, he rushed on to the heat of the encounter. The enemy's ships gave way, and Essex proceeded to land his troops near Puntal, leading the way himself, accompanied by Vere. This done, he proceeded to make an attack on Cadiz. The earl, who seems to have followed the sage advice of Vere, proved successful, and it is recorded to his honour, that he stayed the slaughter, and treated the prisoners with kindness. The English, however, plundered the city. It is recorded that Essex offered to defend it, with four hundred men and provisions for three months, until English succour should arrive. The proposal to defend Cadiz is thought, by a recent biographer of Vere,² to have been suggested by that officer—but, if it was so, still the suspicion which may thus be thrown on the originality of the earl, in regard to the suggestion, is not inconsistent with the fact of his adopting it. This proposal, however, as well as others characteristic of the gallant, perhaps too adventurous Essex, was opposed by his companions; and, on his return home, in August, he published an account of the expedition, "wherein," says Dr Campbell,³ "as Mr Oldys well observes, and therein censures Sir Henry Wotton, the earl blames every body's conduct but his own."⁴

During the absence of Essex, his character had been aspersed by Lord Brooke, and by others who looked on him with coldness or hostility of feeling. The queen, on her part, blamed him for being so liberal in distributing the prize-money. About the same time, his martial zeal and open character drew from Francis Bacon a very curious letter, recommending to him a hypocrisy not very consistent, perhaps, with the character of Essex. But, early in 1597, a reconciliation was effected between the earl and Sir Robert Cecil, by means of Sir Walter Raleigh. The same year, Essex commanded a squadron against the Spaniards. On the way, his squadron was separated from another led by Sir Walter Raleigh, who arrived sooner than his companion at Fayal, which Essex had expressed an intention of attacking. The earl had been appointed commander-in-chief of all the forces employed in the expedition, but Sir Walter, after waiting a few days for Essex's arrival at Fayal, the inhabitants of which were preparing for defence, commenced a successful attack on the island. The earl testified great

² Rev. Mr Gleig—*Lives of British Commanders*, vol. i. See also *Vere's Commentaries*.

³ *Lives of the British Admirals*.

⁴ In this expedition, a library belonging to Osorius, a Portuguese bishop, fell into the hands of Essex, who gave it to the library founded by his friend, Sir Thomas Bodley, in 1597.

dissatisfaction with the conduct of Raleigh, who, he seems to have felt, had deprived him of the honour of the triumph. He also treated with severity certain officers who had concurred in the measure. But he again received Raleigh into favour, at the solicitation of Lord Thomas Howard. Sir William Monson imagines that he was afraid of being called to account in England, should he have dealt hardly with the victorious captain. Essex proceeded to Graciosa, which submitted. But leaving this, the English fleet suffered about forty ships of the Spaniards to escape them. This untoward circumstance is attributed, by Sir William Monson, who was himself in the English fleet, to a want of experience and skill on the part of Essex.⁵ Three ships, however, were taken, the wealth of which, amounting, it is said, to £100,000, went far to compensate for the expenses of the outfit and the voyage. Essex also plundered the town of Villa Franca. The English fleet, after suffering severely from stormy weather, which also prevented a meditated invasion of England by the Spanish ships, reached the English coast in October. The queen expressed dissatisfaction with the favourite; and it must be granted that the part which Essex had borne in the expedition was not a very glorious one. That his failure to intercept the Spanish galleons was an act of weakness, and his resentment at Raleigh for his successful attack on Fayal, an act of selfishness, we shall not deny. Yet, after all, we do not see sufficient evidence in the latter circumstance, or in any other part of the life of Essex, to infer, with Dr Campbell,⁶ that "the earl had no view but to his own particular glory, and that the public service was to be postponed whenever it came in competition therewith." Along with the sense of having failed in this enterprise, or of being considered to have done so, Essex, on his return to England, had the additional mortification of appearing to be robbed of the laurels attending the victory at Cadiz. He found that Elizabeth had issued a patent, conferring on the lord-high-admiral the title of earl of Northampton, on the alleged ground of his success at that capital. Essex, who claimed for himself the honour of that success, retired to Wanstead, pretending, it seems, to be sick, according to what appears to have been a customary mode, in these times, of taking shelter from public mortification, or of suing for royal favour. The queen was moved, and, in December, 1597, created him earl-marshall. She also presented him with the sum of £7000.

The summer of 1598, however, involved the earl in a double quarrel. Urging the continuance of the war with Spain, in opposition to the advice of the venerable Burleigh, he was charged by that minister with being inclined to bloodshed. Burleigh even used the freedom of pointing, in a prayer-book, to the words, "Blood-thirsty men shall not live out half of their days." Whether the charge was just is a question to which it might be an unsatisfactory task to return an answer. Its truth is denied in "an Apology of the Earl of Essex against those who jealously and maliciously tax him as the Hinderer of the Peace and Quiet of his Country," a document which was published in 1603, after the death of the Earl, and which, although long attributed to Francis Bacon, has been argued, from its dissimilarity to Bacon's writings, and its re-

⁵ Monson's Naval Tracts. Campbell's Lives of the British Admirals.

⁶ Lives of the British Admirals.

semblance to the acknowledged works of Essex, to be the composition of the Earl himself.⁷ In the course of the same summer Essex had a serious quarrel with the queen. Differing with her, on one occasion, about the appointment of a governor for Ireland, he turned his back upon her majesty, on which the high-spirited princess gave him a blow on the ear, and bade him "go and be hanged." Clapping his hand on his sword, he swore that not from her father himself would he bear such treatment, and forthwith left the palace. Egerton, the lord-keeper, advised him to submit, and seek forgiveness of the queen. But this he declined to do, in a letter remarkable for the warmth of its spirit, and the beauty of its diction.

After months of retirement from court, the breach between Elizabeth and Essex was so far healed as to admit of his return, although, indeed, Camden remarks, that the earl's overthrow was traced by his friends to this unfortunate quarrel. In August 1598, during the period of the earl's disgrace, Lord Burleigh died. Essex succeeded him as chancellor of Cambridge; and, before the close of the year, he had received another appointment, intimately connected with the closing fortunes of his life. Having objected to the proposal that Lord Mountjoy should be constituted lord-deputy of Ireland—thus intimating, it is supposed, an inclination to accept of the office for himself—he was appointed by the queen to that critical post. In that misgoverned country a rebellion had been raised, headed by Hugh O'Neale, whom the queen had created Earl of Tyrone, against whom Sir John Norris and Sir Henry Bagnal had proved unsuccessful. It was in these circumstances that, with the view of vigorously prosecuting the Irish war, Essex was appointed. He himself objected to undertake the situation, except on certain conditions unacceptable to the queen. His friends, however, in lofty terms commended his talents; and his enemies—from hostile feelings, it has not without reason been supposed—concurred in the eulogiums. At last, in March 1599, with the tender farewell of the queen, and with the acclamations of the people, he set out for Ireland. His army consisted of 20,000 foot, and 1300 horse, and he was attended by a large train of gentlemen and nobles. His first act, after his arriving in Dublin, was to appoint his friend, the earl of Southampton, general of the horse. This was contrary to the will of Elizabeth, who, on hearing of the appointment, enjoined her commander to recall it. Essex unsuccessfully attempted, by a statement of reasons, to satisfy her on the subject. Another cause of offence to Elizabeth was the conduct of the war. For, notwithstanding Essex's own objections to the inefficient manner in which measures had previously been pursued against the rebels, he was induced, by advice, respecting the unsuitableness of the season for marching against the rebels in Ulster, to make a previous attempt, in opposition to a slighter insurrection in another district of the country, and when, after receiving from England an addition of 2000 foot, he proceeded, late in the season, against the Ulster rebels, his army, wasted by disease, was miserably reduced in number, and many of the soldiers deserted. On coming into contact with the rebels, there was a little fighting; but, on Tyrone requesting a parley, Essex granted it, and met him on the bank of the ford of Ballyclinch, in the midst of

⁷ Criminal Trials. (*Lib. of Entertaining Knowledge*,) vol. i. p. 292.

which the Irish chieftain sat, mounted on his horse. The result of the conference was a truce, which was to be renewed at intervals of six weeks, but might be broken off by a fortnight's warning from either party. There seems also to have been a correspondence with Tyrone little creditable to the fidelity of Essex, who, attended by several of his officers, held a second conference with the rebel chief. Now, however, having seen visible signs of danger to his interests in England, from the real or apprehended aspersions of his enemies, he suddenly betook himself from his army, without her majesty's permission, attended by his household, and certain of his officers, leaving the government of Ireland to the archbishop of Dublin and Sir George Carew. It appears that he had even had some design of carrying along with him a considerable part of his troops, with a view to alarm his enemies at home. On reaching Nonsuch, where at that time Elizabeth held her court, he hurried up stairs, and advanced to the chamber of the queen. Though she was not yet completely dressed, he fell before her on his knees, and kissed her hand. She received him graciously, and, at a second interview, he met with a similar reception. But there were some who seem to have looked on him with other eyes; among these was Sir Robert Cecil. In the evening of this very day, he appeared to have lost the favour of the queen. She asked an explanation of his conduct in returning; and he was appointed to be examined that very night by several privy-councillors. Next day there was a general meeting of the council, before whom he was accused of presumption in his correspondence, disobedience in his conduct of the war, extravagance in the distribution of knighthood, contempt and rashness in returning, and unseemly boldness in intruding into the chamber of the queen. The earl, who had previously been commanded to remain in his chamber, calmly answered the charges. On the 2d of October, however, he was forbidden to attend at court, and intrusted to the lord-keeper. On the severity with which he was treated, there seemed at length to dawn some hope of royal favour. But a contrary effect was produced, when a letter from Tyrone was intercepted, representing the impossibility of inducing his comrades to acquiesce in the terms of truce to which he and Essex had agreed. The queen was incensed, and, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the council, the humble intercessions of the earl, and the faithful support of Lady Scrope—of whom Whyte remarks, that she suffered much from Elizabeth on account of her endeavours to prevail with her on behalf of Essex—the haughty princess declined to release him. At length, however, a sickness under which he laboured seemed to move her. She gave him liberty to see a few friends, and to walk in the garden; and, on one occasion, she directed eight physicians to hold a consultation on his case. Their report being very unfavourable, she sent a kind message, declaring, that if it were honourable she would visit him. But this seems to have been rather a fit of compassion, started by a mournful and critical occasion, than the renewed approbation of offended majesty. In course of time, even his wife was prevented from paying him a daily visit. In March 1600, however, he was allowed to remove to his own dwelling, under the charge of the lord-keeper, for which act of clemency he presented submissive acknowledgments.

At length, eighteen commissioners from the privy council were ap-

pointed for the consideration of his cause, which came before them on the 5th of June, 1600. The charges having been brought forward by the crown-lawyers, including Francis Bacon, of whom the earl had formerly been the munificent benefactor, the latter on his knees delivered a defence, in which, besides acknowledging his misconduct, he apologized for certain of his measures. The discourse is said to have drawn tears from many of the councillors, but they unanimously agreed that he should not continue to act as privy-councillor, earl-marshal, or master of the ordnance, and should remain in his own house until the queen should be pleased to remit the penalty. In August he was freed from imprisonment, but was still prohibited from attending court. He expressed an intention of living in retirement, but also a wish to be allowed to kiss the queen's hand,—a privilege, however, that was not afforded him. She also refused to renew a grant which he enjoyed of a monopoly of sweet wines. In making the request that she would do so, he declared, that, until his restoration to her favour, he meant to resemble the king, whose habitation was with the beasts of the field, who ate hay like an ox, and was wet with the dews of heaven. She replied that she was glad to find him in such a proper temper, and that she hoped his actions would correspond to his professions, but, in reference to his request to have the sweet wine monopoly renewed, observed, that an unmanageable beast must be stinted of his provender. It is scarcely wonderful that Essex should at last have broken out in rude expressions respecting the queen, declaring, as he is reported to have done, that her mind was become as crooked as her carcase,—an insult which, if really reported to her, as it is said to have been, may be supposed to have been little fitted to pacify her offended majesty. At Essex-house, an open table was kept, and sermons were delivered by puritans, to which the citizens were admitted. These arrangements, too, were probably displeasing to the queen. But, unfortunately, the earl was urged into more desperate schemes. Sir John Harrington, who had attended him to Ireland, and received from him the honour of knighthood, was now induced to leave him, according to his own account, by the violent conduct he displayed. Harrington states that he spoke most unwisely of the queen, grounding on the case of his unfortunate patron, the conclusion, that disappointed ambition quickly induces madness,—⁸ a weighty and monitory lesson, if it 'find fit audience' of the tumultuous aspirant after power, and of the restless dependent on his prince's favour,—the Tantalus of the court. Besides corresponding with James VI. of Scotland, against the party of Cecil, which he represented as inclined to support a Spanish right to the English throne in preference to that of James, and also with Lord Mountjoy, his successor as lord-deputy in Ireland, whom he sought to induce to bring over troops, the earl co-operated with a council of six of his friends at Drury-house, respecting the carrying into effect of an attempt against his enemies. In the course of these preparatory steps, he incurred suspicion at court, and on the 7th of February, 1601, by direction of the privy-council, he was summoned to appear before them. On this he gathered round him some of his friends, and pointed out the appearance of danger. It was agreed to enter the city next

⁸ *Nugæ*. The passage referred to is given in Miss Aiken's *Court of Elizabeth*, vol. ii. p. 463.

day with a band of two hundred gentlemen. A report was spread in the city of a design by Cobham and Raleigh against the life of Essex, who was to throw himself, in his attempt, on the support of the citizens of London, and if he succeeded in securing their assistance, was to use it for gaining access to the queen. In the morning of next day, which was Sunday, the 8th of February, the lord-keeper and two other crown-officers demanded entrance into Essex-house in the queen's name, and on entering by the wicket, saw the earl, with some of his friends, standing in the midst of a multitude of people. The lord-keeper conversed with him respecting these hostile appearances. Essex represented himself as injured by perfidy. During the conference, there was a tumult among the people, whom the lord-keeper, putting on his hat, commanded to lay down their arms and leave the place. On this, a cry of violence was raised, and Essex, remarking that he had to go to the city, but should soon return, drew his sword, and rushed out of his house accompanied by about two hundred men, having previously directed his visitors to be detained. Forthwith he proceeded through the city, where he shouted, "For the queen, for the queen,—a plot is laid for my life!" Still a popular favourite, he was greeted with benedictions on his way. But from ignorance of his meaning, or indisposition to join so hazardous a cause, the citizens made no powerful movement on his side. The court-party, however, took measures of defence. Lord Burleigh made his appearance, accompanied by a few horsemen. The palace was fortified, and troops were placed at Ludgate. On these, Sir Christopher Blount made an attack, and killed an officer; but he himself was wounded and taken prisoner, and a young man of the same party was killed. After this skirmish, Essex, who had himself been shot through the hat, proceeded to Queenhithe, and thence to Essex-house, from which he found the prisoners he had left behind him gone. He fortified the house. It was soon surrounded by the queen's troops, commanded by the lord-admiral and others. Sir Robert Sidney called for a surrender, to which the earl at last consented. Next day he was taken to the Tower; and on the 19th he was brought to trial in Westminster-hall, along with his comrade, the earl of Southampton. When called upon to lift up his hand, Essex remarked, "that he had, before that time, done it often at her majesty's command, for a better purpose." On the indictment being read, he pleaded not guilty. Sir Edward Coke, as attorney-general, delivered an oration against him, in which he methodically considers, first, the quality of the rebellion,—secondly, the manner of it,—thirdly, the persons who engaged in it,—and fourthly, the person against whom it was committed, ending in these insolent terms,—"The earl would call a parliament, and himself decide all matters which did not make for his purpose. A bloody parliament would that have been, where my lord of Essex, that now stands all in black, would have worn a bloody robe! But now, in God's just judgment, he of his earldom shall be Robert the Last, that of a kingdom thought to be Robert the First."

In prison, the earl was wrought upon by a divine chosen by himself, but employed, it has been supposed, by government, to serve their own purposes. Essex, under this influence, is said to have made a full disclosure, confessing what had been proved against him on the trial, and mentioning certain persons confederate with him in the

scheme. He also asked forgiveness of those whom he had represented as his enemies. In regard to his confession, however, it has been remarked, and it may be proper to repeat, that we only know what was made known respecting it by the queen and council. It seems also to be uncertain whether or not he requested to be executed privately. Doubt has even been thrown of late on the long familiar record of Elizabeth's vacillating conduct in regard to the signing of the warrant for his death.⁹ For this fact, however, there is surely strong evidence in the statement of Camden and the character of the queen—how doubtful soever the story of Lady Southampton and the ring, as noticed in our life of Elizabeth, may be. At length, however, his doom was sealed, and on the 25th of February, 1601, he was brought to a scaffold erected within the Tower. The execution was private, but there were a few spectators. One of these was Sir Walter Raleigh, but this is a matter of which different accounts are given.¹⁰ On the scaffold, Essex was attended by Dr Barlow. He denied having meant any violence to the person of the queen, but confessed that he was a most wretched sinner, and that his sins were more in number than the hairs of his head. As he laid down his neck on the block, he commended his soul to Jesus Christ, and after a delay, in the course of which he said, "O strike! strike!" three blows from the executioner severed his head from his body.

Thus died, in the 34th year of his age, the gallant earl of Essex. Rash and imprudent he unquestionably was, nor can he be said to have always acted a brilliant part in the enterprises, or an honourable one amidst the rivalries, of his short but active and eventful life. "Give me the man," says a well-known Roman poet, "who can be praised independently of death,"¹¹ and that the favourable interest felt in the life of Essex is, in a great degree, derived from the touching circumstances in which he closed it, it may be impossible to deny. Yet the gallantry of his nature, the beauty of his writings, and, it may be, the very 'flash and outbreak of his fiery mind,' still invest him with a certain moral radiance, which, false and unwarranted as perhaps in a great degree it is, may yet go far to explain the popularity which crowned him in his life-time.

Clifford, Earl of Cumberland.

BORN A. D. 1568.—DIED A. D. 1603.

GEORGE CLIFFORD, distinguished as a man of naval enterprise, was

⁹ Criminal Trials, (*Library of Entertaining Knowledge*,) vol. i. p. 369, 370.

¹⁰ That Raleigh, however, in the closing days of Essex, was warmly opposed to him, seems evident from a letter of the former to Sir Robert Cecil, printed in Murdon's *State Papers*, and republished in Dr Campbell's *Lives of the British Admirals—Memoir of Sir W. Raleigh*. "Let the queen hold Bothwell," says Sir Walter, "while she hath him. He will ever be the canker of her estate and safety. Princes are lost by security, and preserved by prevention. I have seen the last of her good days, and all ours, after his liberty." Dr Campbell considers the reference here to Bothwell as an allusion to the character and conduct of Stuart, earl of Bothwell, which the Doctor compares with those of Essex, remarking, that "there is nothing more shrewd and sensible in the letter than the giving Essex the name."

¹¹ "Hunc volo laudari qui sine morte potest,"—*Martial*.

the son of the second, and grandson of the first, Clifford, earl of Cumberland, the latter of whom, son of Lord Clifford, (who, disguised in his youth as a Westmoreland shepherd, on the accession of Henry VII., assumed the hereditary title,) was advanced to the earldom by Henry VIII. George Clifford was born in 1568, in the county of Westmoreland, and, by direction of Queen Elizabeth, whose ward he became by his father's death, proceeded to Cambridge, and studied under Dr Whitgift. At the university his mind was especially bent on mathematics—to which circumstance, it is little to be wondered at that his future nautical distinction should have been in some degree attributed. So early as 1586, he fitted out a few ships, which, proceeding to the coast of America, made inroads on the trade of Portugal. In 1588, he commanded a ship against the Spanish armada, and took a distinguished part in an action fought on that memorable occasion, off the town of Calais. The defeat of this formidable attempt at the invasion of England, was followed by hostile expeditions undertaken by English subjects, though occasionally, at least, encouraged and assisted by the queen, against the Spanish power. Sir Francis Drake, after conducting one of the most considerable of these, which proved a disastrous enterprise, was met on his way home by the earl of Cumberland, who had equipped a fleet of seven vessels, six of which were prepared at his own expense, the other being lent him by the queen. The earl was enabled, by granting a seasonable supply of provisions, to avert the death of many of Drake's crew, and proceeding onward to the Terceiras, seized some prizes, one of which, estimated at £100,000, was lost in the return on the coast of Cornwall. Cumberland engaged in several other expeditions of the kind, but after a few voyages, always declined Elizabeth's proposals to lend him vessels of her own, because, it is alleged, of her imposing it as an express condition, that he should never lay any of her vessels on board a Spanish ship, the idea of which seems to have been associated in her mind with suspicions of fire and devastation. In one of these enterprises, undertaken in 1598, with a squadron of eleven ships, fitted out at his own expense, he sought to intercept a Lisbon fleet in its passage to India. Failing in this object, he proceeded to the Canaries, plundered the island of Lancerota, and went onwards to America. Landing at Puerto Rico, he took the capital, for which he refused a ransom offered by the inhabitants. His object, it seems, was to make this his head-quarters, from which he might engage in cruising on the Spanish coasts. But disease spreading among his men, he returned home. Indeed, although the earl, in his maritime career, was occasionally fortunate, yet, on the whole, he did greatly less to aggrandize his fortune than to manifest his zeal.

But Cumberland was not merely a maritime adventurer, and, if his distinction chiefly rests on his foreign enterprise, his character would be very incompletely drawn, did we not advert to his eminence at court. He was one of the knights-tilters who graced that splendid scene, and proved eminently successful in the chivalrous amusements of the time. At these he wore, set with diamonds, on his high-crowned beaver, a glove, which her Majesty, by design or by accident, had dropped, and, on his taking it up, desired him to retain. On the retirement of Sir Henry Lee from the situation of queen's champion, the earl succeeded him. The ceremonies of his installation were charac-

teristic of the time. After the knights-tilters had performed in courtly exercises, Sir Henry and his intended successor proceeded to the bottom of the gallery, where the queen and her retinue were seated, advancing to the sound of music, which was accompanied by a ditty in which a performer behind the scenes made mention of the old age and proposed retirement of the venerable champion. During this part of the ceremonial, there appeared a pavilion in imitation of a vestal temple, in front of which stood an ornamented pillar, having a tablet attached to it, with the name of Elizabeth inscribed. The tablet was presented to the queen, as were also certain rich presents which had been laid on an altar within the pavilion. At the bottom of the pillar, the aged champion, now disarmed, offered to his royal mistress the accoutrements of his office, and then, on his knees, presented to her the earl of Cumberland, whom he prayed her to accept of as her knight. The queen assented—on which Sir Henry armed and mounted the earl, and invested his own person with a peaceful garb. Cumberland received another honour from Elizabeth when, in 1591 or 1592, she presented him with the order of the Garter, “which,” says a biographer of the British admirals,¹ “in her reign, was never bestowed till it had been deserved by signal services to the public.” She seems also to have sought, by his instrumentality, to control the spirit of the earl of Essex, and, at the condemnation of that ill-fated favourite by the privy council, in 1600, Cumberland endeavoured to mitigate the sentence, to which, however, he assented, in expectation, he alleged, of Essex receiving mercy from the queen. He was in great favour with Elizabeth’s successor, James VI., but died early in his reign. That event happened on the 30th of October, 1605. The earl’s remains were conveyed from the Savoy, London, to Skipton in Yorkshire, and there interred. Before his death he had squandered his fortune; nor, high as he may rank as a man of talent, science, enterprise, and chivalry, is his memory as a husband free from the charge of cruelty. From his lady, a daughter of the earl of Bedford, he was separated, and for her future comfort he failed of making adequate provision. He was the last male heir of his family, but his only daughter Anne deserves a particular notice.

This lady was born in 1589, at Skipton castle, and married, first to Lord Buckhurst, of whom she wrote a memorial, and afterwards to the earl of Pembroke. She erected a monument to the memory of the poet Daniel, who had been her instructor, and raised a similar memorial over the honoured grave of Spenser. Nor must we here omit her famous answer to Sir Joseph Williamson, the secretary of state, who had proposed a member for the countess’s burgh of Appleby:—“I have been bullied by an usurper,—I have been neglected by a court,—but I will not be dictated to by a subject,—your man sha’n’t stand.” Two hospitals and seven churches were either built or repaired by this high-spirited female—in whose character, it may be natural to recognise, acting in a different direction, and pervaded, perhaps, by nobler principles, the ardour and activity of mind which prompted her father’s course of adventurous and persevering enterprise.

¹ Dr J. Campbell.

VERE, Earl of Oxford.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1540.—DIED A. D. 1604.

EDWARD VERE, seventeenth earl of Oxford, was born in the year 1540 or 1541. His character presents an extraordinary union of the rudeness and impetuosity of a feudal baron with the mental accomplishments and personal graces of the scholar and travelled nobleman. Having spent some years of his early life in foreign travel, he is said to have imported not a few of the refinements and fopperies of other countries into England. In particular, he is said to have been the first who introduced the use of embroidered gloves and perfumery; he aped Italian dresses, and was called 'the mirror of Tuscanismo;' yet he was not a mere *petit-maitre*, but held an honourable place among the chivalrous and fiery spirits of his age. In the manly exercises of the tilt and tournament he had few superiors; and on one occasion he acquitted himself so gallantly in the jousts, that the fair umpires led him, all armed as he was, into the presence-chamber, to receive the prize from her majesty's hand. Soon after enjoying this distinguished honour, he incurred a disgrace equally marked and public, being committed to the Tower for dishonourable conduct towards one of the queen's maids of honour. On other occasions, his fierce and lawless spirit burst forth with an impetuosity which defied all checks but those of absolute coercion and physical restraint. Having been wounded by Sir Thomas Knevet in a duel, which he had himself provoked, he sought to take open and fatal revenge upon his antagonist, and was only prevented carrying his bloody design into execution by the interference of the queen, who also allowed Sir Thomas to keep a guard around his own person. He also publicly insulted the amiable Sir Philip Sidney in the tennis-court of the palace, and the queen could discover no other means of preventing fatal consequences than by entreating Sir Philip to make an apology to the overbearing nobleman, which Sir Philip did in compliance with her majesty's wishes, although he instantly retired from court in disgust. In 1586, the earl sat as great chamberlain of England on the trial of Mary, queen of Scots; and, in 1588, we find him fitting out ships at his own expense against the armada. Thomas, duke of Norfolk, was the nephew of this nobleman, and on Burleigh refusing to intercede for the duke, Oxford got so incensed, that "in most absurd and unjust revenge," he forsook his own wife's bed, and sold or dissipated the greater part of that vast inheritance which had been bequeathed to him by his ancestors. He died in the early part of the reign of James I.

This nobleman enjoyed in his own times a considerable poetical reputation. Among his eulogists, are his contemporaries Lilly, Mun-day, and Spenser. His once celebrated comedies have perished, but some of his sonnets, which are preserved in the 'Paradise of Dainty Devices,' are not the worst in that curious collection. His lady was also a poetess. Some of her pieces are to be found in a collection of odes and sonnets, entitled 'Diana,' published by one John Southern.

Sir Edmund Anderson.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1540.—DIED A. D. 1605.

SIR EDMUND ANDERSON, an English lawyer of Scotch descent, was born about the year 1540, at Broughton, or Flixborough, in Lincolnshire. He studied at Lincoln college, Oxford, from whence he removed to the Inner Temple. In 1577, he was appointed sergeant-at-law to the queen, and the year afterwards, one of the justices of assize, in which character he distinguished himself by his unrelenting severity towards the Brownists while on the Norfolk circuit of 1581. In 1582, he was made lord-chief-justice of the common pleas, and the year following, received the honour of knighthood. He sat in the star-chamber when sentence of death was pronounced against Mary, queen of Scots; and presided in the same court at Davison's trial. Anderson was justly considered an able lawyer, however, and adhered with rigorous exactness to the letter of the statutes. In the trial of Henry Cuffe, secretary to the earl of Essex, when the attorney-general was proceeding to argue the case on general principles, the chief-justice interrupted him, by observing, "I sit here to judge of law, and not of logic:" but when an advocate, in favour of his cause, urged the want of certain precedents, the lord-chief-justice replied, "What of that? shall we give no judgment because it is not adjudged in the books before? We will give judgment according to reason; and if there be no reason in the books, I will not regard them." He did not hesitate to oppose the queen when she stretched her prerogative beyond the limit of the law; and he joined with the rest of the judges, and the barons of exchequer, in a remonstrance against the arbitrary authority occasionally assumed by the court. Upon the accession of James I., he was continued in office, and remained in it till his death, which happened in 1605. There can be no doubt that Sir Edmund was a sound lawyer; and, perhaps, on the whole, he was an honest man; but the intolerant and persecuting spirit which he manifested on all occasions towards the nonconformists, particularly in the case of Udal and Robert Brown, must for ever attach a stigma to his memory. His works are, 'Reports of Cases adjudged in the time of Queen Elizabeth, in the Common Bench,' in folio, London, 1644; and, 'Resolutions and Judgments in the Courts of Westminster,' published in 1653. The title is now extinct.

Blount, Earl of Devonshire.

BORN A. D. 1563.—DIED A. D. 1606.

ONE of the most distinguished ornaments of Elizabeth's court, was Charles, second son of James, Lord Mountjoy. He was born in the year 1563, and destined to the profession of the law, for the fallen fortunes of his family rendered it necessary for him to seek his subsistence by dint of his own honourable exertions. His grandfather had curtailed the family-revenue by the expenses into which he launched in

order to keep pace with the luxuries of Henry's court ; his father had rendered matters still worse by seeking to overcome all his embarrassments by the possession of the philosopher's stone ; and his elder brother had nearly dissipated the remnant by the most profuse and unjustifiable prodigality. In these circumstances Charles not only resolved to push his own way through the world, but to restore the sinking honours of his family. And it is recorded of him, that so early had this honourable desire taken possession of his bosom, that upon his parents proposing to have a portrait taken of him while yet a youth, he desired to be painted with a trowel in his hand, and this motto,—“ *Ad reedificandam antiquam domum.*”

Sir Robert Naunton has thus sketched his early manhood. “ As he came from Oxford, he took the Inner temple on his way to the court, whither he no sooner came, but, without asking, he had a pretty strange kind of admission, which I have heard from a discreet man of his own, and much more of the secrets of these times. He was then much about twenty years of age ; of a brown hair, a sweet face, a most neat composure, and tall in his person. The queen was then at Whitehall at dinner, whither he came to see the fashion of the court. The queen had soon found him out, and with a kind of affected frown, asked the lady-carver who he was. She answered she knew him not, inso-much as an inquiry was made from one to another who he might be, till at length it was told the queen he was brother to Lord William Mountjoy. This inquisition, with the eye of majesty fixed upon him (as she was wont to do, and to daunt men she knew not), stirred the blood of this young gentleman insomuch as his colour came and went, which the queen observing, called him unto her and gave him her hand to kiss, encouraging him with gracious words, and new looks ; and so, diverting her speech to the lords and ladies, she said that she no sooner observed him but that she knew there was in him some noble blood, with some other expressions of pity towards his house ; and then, again demanding his name, she said, ‘ fail you not to come to the court, and I will bethink myself how to do you good.’ And this was his inlet, and the beginnings of his grace ; where it falls into consideration, that though he wanted not wit and courage, for he had very fine attractions, and being a good piece of a scholar, yet were they accompanied with the retractives of bashfulness and a natural modesty, which, as the tone of his house and the ebb of his fortunes then stood, might have hindered his progression, had they not been reinforced by the infusion of sovereign favour, and the queen's gracious invitation. And, that it may appear how low he was, and how much that heretic necessity will work in the dejection of good spirits, I can deliver it with assurance, that his exhibition was very scant until his brother died, which was shortly after his admission to the court, and then it was no more than a thousand marks per annum, wherewith he lived plentifully in a fine way and garb, and without any great sustentation, during all his time ; and as there was in his nature a kind of backwardness which did not befriend him, nor suit with the motion of the court, so there was in him an inclination to arms, with a humour of travelling and gadding about, which, had not some wise men about him laboured to remove, and the queen herself laid in her commands, he would, out of his natural propensity, have marred his own market.”

In 1594, he was appointed governor of Portsmouth, and in the same year he succeeded to the barony of Mountjoy on the death of his elder brother. He now stood high in the queen's good graces, and in 1597 was appointed lieutenant-general of the land forces in the expedition under Essex to the Azores. It is certain, that notwithstanding the queen's favour, the jealousy of Essex retarded the promotion of Mountjoy. But on the fall of that favourite he rapidly rose in honour and employments. He succeeded Essex in the command in Ireland, and in two campaigns reduced that country to obedience; thus fulfilling the queen's 'prophetical speech,' as recorded by Naunton, "that it would be his fortune and his honour to cut the thread of that fatal rebellion, and to bring her in peace to the grave."

James acknowledged and rewarded Mountjoy's merits, by appointing him lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and creating him earl of Devonshire. But he does not appear to have resided much in his government. He died on the 3d of April, 1606. Fynes Morrison, who had been the earl's secretary in Ireland, declares that "grief of unsuccessful love brought him to his last end." In early life he had privately interchanged vows of attachment with Penelope, eldest daughter of Walter Devereux, earl of Essex. But he had not yet raised himself above the adversity which clouded his early years, and the parents of his lady love forced their daughter to give her hand to Robert, Lord Rich. A guilty connexion between the lovers followed; and at last, Lady Rich abandoned her husband, and fled to the arms of the earl, taking with her her five children, whom she declared to be his issue. The earl received the unfortunate woman, and on her divorce from Lord Rich, was married to her on December, 1605. He survived this wretched union but a few months.

Sir Francis de Vere.

BORN A. D. 1554.—DIED A. D. 1608.

FRANCIS DE VERE, the second son of Geoffrey De Vere, and grandson of John De Vere, fifteenth earl of Oxford, was born at Castle-Henningham, in Essex, or, according to others, at Colchester, in the year 1554. His ancestors, from the first arrival of the family in the person of Alaric De Vere, who accompanied the Conqueror to England, had filled the most honourable posts under their respective sovereigns. At an early age the young Francis was put to study 'the noble profession of arms;' but it was not until his thirty-first year that he had an opportunity of witnessing actual service. In December, 1585, he accompanied the English expedition to Flushing, as a volunteer, and soon afterwards attached himself to the gallant Sir Philip Sidney, whose death he witnessed in the battle of Warnsfield. In 1587 he gallantly assisted in the defence of Sluys, and next year served in the defence of Bergen-op-Zoom, under Lord Willoughby. On this occasion he was intrusted with the command of two companies of foot, and the important charge of the island of Toretote; but after that the duke of Parma had converted the siege into a blockade, De Vere solicited and obtained permission to occupy one of the two forts situated between the

town and the river, in the defence of which, our young soldier perceived more glory was to be obtained than in service within the walls. Here he lured a strong detachment of the duke's army into a snare, by which 500 men were cut off, and a general panic diffused throughout the besieging army, in consequence of which the siege was hastily abandoned. De Vere's eminent services on this occasion were rewarded with the honour of knighthood, and from this period his name holds a distinguished place in the annals of English warfare.

In the spring of 1589, De Vere commanded a body of 600 of his countrymen, under Prince Maurice, the general-in-chief of the Dutch forces. In this service, with a force of only 800 men, he successfully defended the island of Voorn against Mansfeldt's forces, then amounting to 12,000, and compelled that general to change the plan of his campaign. The next service which he rendered the States was the relief of Bergh upon the Rhine, then closely besieged by the marquess of Warrenbon, and suffering severely for want of provisions. Arriving, at the head of a small force, in the rear of the enemy's lines, he boldly charged through them, threw in the much-needed supplies, and then cut his way back again to Caleti. But the garrison of Bergh was soon as much distressed as ever for want of provisions, and the investing corps had meanwhile received considerable reinforcements, whereupon the States desired Sir Francis to throw in a fresh supply. The commission appeared almost a desperate one, yet it was instantly undertaken by him. With admirable dexterity he led the convoy through a narrow defile in the face of overwhelming numbers, and entered Bergh without the loss of a single waggon. His retreat was still more successfully executed. Quitting the town under cover of a thick fog, and pursuing a new route, he entirely escaped the notice of the besieging forces, and arrived safely at his original station, bringing along with him his wounded men in the empty waggons.

In the succeeding summer, De Vere's services were demanded to relieve the castle of Litkenhooven, which he at once undertook, though unprovided with a single piece of artillery, and achieved with small loss. On his return through the country of Cleves, having learned that Burick on the Rhine was in the hands of the enemy, he resolved to regain it, and after having been twice driven back by the garrison of the citadel, the place was put into his hands by the governor at the moment preparations were making for a third attack. The return of the duke of Parma rendered it necessary for Prince Maurice to concentrate his divisions, and De Vere's detachment was ordered to Deesburg. Here it was intimated to him that the prince intended to invest Zutphen, and in order to facilitate the siege, De Vere made himself master of a strong fort in the neighbourhood, by a stratagem which is thus related by himself in his Commentaries: "I chose," he says, "a good number of lusty and hardy young soldiers, the most of which I appressed like the countrywomen of those parts, the rest like the men: gave to some baskets, to others packs, and such burthens as the people usually carry to the market, with pistols and short swords, and daggers under their garments, willing them, by two or three in a company, by break of day, to be at the ferry of Zutphen, which is just against the fort, as if they staid for the passage-boat of the town; and bade them there to sit and rest themselves in the meantime, as near the gate of

the fort as they could for avoiding suspicion, and to seize upon the same as soon as it was opened, which took so good effect, that they possessed the entry of the fort, and held the same till an officer with two hundred soldiers—who was laid in a covert not far off—came to their succour, and so became fully master of the place. By which means the siege of the town afterwards proved the shorter.”

The fall of Zutphen was followed by the surrender of Deventer, and the advance of Prince Maurice into Friesland, from whence he was suddenly recalled by the States-general, on the appearance of the duke of Parma in the Beltow, one of those large islands formed betwixt the Rhine and the Waal. The duke had formed the siege of Kosenburg, a castle which protects the ferry of Nimeguen, before Maurice came up; and the latter despaired of being able to drive so consummate a general from the strong position in which he now found him. Not so De Vere. He attentively reconnoitred the position of the enemy, and quickly devised a plan for leading him into an ambuscade, in which he so effectually succeeded, that the duke, disheartened by the loss of a large body of his finest cavalry, instantly raised the siege, and retreated “with more dishonour than in any action that he had undertaken in these warres.”

We hear no more of our gallant countryman till the year 1596, excepting that, in 1592, he was chosen member of parliament for the borough of Leominster. It is certain, however, that he continued in the military employment of the States until 1596, when he was recalled to take part in the expedition against Cadiz, prompted by Elizabeth's high-admiral. On the 10th of June that year, the armament, consisting of 15,000 men and 150 ships, put to sea, and on the 1st of July arrived at the mouth of Cadiz bay. It was immediately resolved to force the entrance to the bay, and drive the Spanish fleet, which was laid across it, from its moorings. In this service De Vere bore, as usual, a distinguished part; and the subsequent capture of the town was mainly attributable to his gallant and judicious conduct. His opinion, however, that the place should be retained, was overruled, and orders given for its destruction, after which the troops leisurely re-embarked. It is recorded, to the immortal honour of De Vere and his companions, that, on this occasion, not a single life was taken in cold blood, nor had a single female to complain that she had suffered violence or insult from an English soldier. De Vere, however, informs us that “he got three prisoners on the occasion worth 10,000 ducats; one a churchman and president of the contradutation of the Indies, the other two ancient knights.”

On the return of the Spanish expedition to England, De Vere spent a few months at court, and then set out again for the Low countries. But he had scarcely put foot on the old theatre of his military exploits, when he was summoned to repair to England to assist in planning and executing an enterprise against the Spanish West India fleet. The failure of this expedition is well known. Essex, the commander, returned baffled and dispirited, and his enemies keenly endeavoured to turn the queen's resentment against him; but De Vere, though he had felt himself aggrieved by the appointment of Lord Mountjoy to the first command, nobly disdained to take advantage of Essex in his hour of humiliation, and, on his presentation at court, spoke so warmly in his favour, that he completely removed the impression which the enemies

of Essex had made on the queen. "This office I performed to his lordship," says he, "to the grieving and bitter incensing of the contrary party against me, when, notwithstanding, I had discovered, as is aforesaid, in my reconciliation his lordship's coldness of affection to me, and had plainly told my lord himself mine own resolution, in which I still persisted not to follow his lordship any more to the warres; yet, to make a full return as I could for the good favour the world supposed his lordship bore me, fearing more to incur the opinion of ingratitude than the malice of any enemies, how great soever, which the delivery of truth could procure me."

De Vere's reward for this and other services was his appointment to the governorship of Brille. Before he had resided two months here, he planned an enterprise for the taking of Turnhout, which completely succeeded, although the conduct of Prince Maurice prevented the forces of the States from reaping all the advantages of the movements which De Vere had suggested. In January 1598, De Vere returned to England, and presented himself at court, where he seems to have been but indifferently received. He then retired to the Hague, where he continued to reside till recalled by his royal mistress on the threat of an invasion. In 1599 we find him again in the field with Prince Maurice, and, contrary to what might have been expected from him, counselling the prince to be cautious how he attempted to carry the war into Flanders. His advices, though not wholly disregarded, were in the main overlooked; and the result was, that the archduke Albert, who commanded the Spanish forces, soon pressed upon the small army of the States, and compelled Maurice to risk a battle against great odds. De Vere's admirable dispositions, however, secured the victory for the patriots, and won for him, from all competent judges, a place in the first rank of military commanders. The defeat of the Spaniards was complete, although the whole brunt of the battle was borne by De Vere's English troops alone.

The last and most illustrious military service performed by De Vere was the defence of Ostend against the archduke Albert, who had placed it suddenly in a state of siege. The force of the besiegers exceed 13,000 men; the total force under De Vere's command did not exceed 2400; yet with this comparatively insignificant garrison, scarcely amounting to one half of the number required for manning the fortifications, did he baffle the utmost efforts of the archduke to get possession of the place. Once only did De Vere condescend to negotiation with his powerful antagonist, for the purpose of gaining time. The questionable stratagem succeeded, and the arrival of reinforcements enabled him again to hurl defiance at his proud foe, which he did in the following laconic note:—

"We have heretofore held it necessary, for certain reasons, to treat with the deputies which had authority from your highness; but whilst we were about to conclude upon the conditions and articles, there are arrived certain of our ships of warre, by whom we have received part of that which we had need of; and that we cannot, with our honour and oath, continue the treaty, nor proceed in it, which we hope that your highness will not take in ill part; and that, nevertheless, when your power shall reduce us to the like estate, you will not refuse, as a most generous prince, to vouchsafe us again a gentle audience. From our town of Ostend, 25th day of December, 1601.

FRANCIS DE VERE."

Nothing could now exceed the indignation of the archduke, who swore a solemn oath that he would spare no living thing within the walls of the devoted town, and instantly issued orders to prepare for the assault. On the 8th of January, the assault commenced soon after midnight; but the assailants were so warmly received that, after a desperate conflict, they were compelled to retire with a loss of 2000 men. Notwithstanding this gallant and successful conduct, De Vere was shortly afterwards superseded in the command of Ostend by General Dorp. In June 1603, we find him in attendance at the court of St James's. The next year, the conclusion of peace between England and Spain compelled James to withdraw his troops from the Low countries, and led, therefore, to the dismissal of De Vere from the military employment which he held under the States.

On the 28th of August, 1608, Sir Francis died at his own house in London, in the 54th year of his age. He was interred in St John's chapel, Westminster, where a fine monument was erected to his memory by his widow, the daughter of a London citizen. He had three sons and two daughters, all of whom died before him. "Sir Francis Vere," says Sir Robert Naughton, "was of that ancient and most noble extract of the earls of Oxford; and it may be a question whether the nobility of his house, or the honour of his achievements, might most commend him; but that we have an authentic rule,—

Nam genus et proavos et quæ non fecimus ipsi,
Vix ea nostra voco.

For though he was an honourable slip of that ancient tree of nobility, which was no disadvantage to his virtue, yet he brought more glory to the name of Vere than he took blood from the family. He was, amongst all the queen's swordsmen, inferior unto none, but superior unto many; of whom it may be said, to speak much of him were to leave out somewhat that might add to his praise, and to forget more than would make to his honour. I find not that he came much to court, for he lived almost perpetually in the camp; but when he did, none had more of the queen's favour, and none less envied; for he seldome troubled it with the noise and alarms of supplications,—his way was another sort of undermining. They report that the queen, as she loved martial men, would court this gentleman as soon as he appeared in her presence; and surely he was a soldier of great worth and command,—thirty years in the service of the States, and twenty years over the English in chief, as the queen's general!"

De Vere was a man of letters, as well as an accomplished general, and wrote an account of the principal military transactions in which he was engaged, which was published from his MSS. by Dr William Dillingham, in 1657, under the title of 'The Commentaries of Sir Francis Vere.'

II.—ECCLESIASTICAL SERIES.

Cardinal Bouchier.

DIED A. D. 1487.

THOMAS BOURCHIER, archbishop of Canterbury in the successive reigns of Henry VI., Edward IV., Edward V., Richard III., and Henry VII., was descended from an illustrious family, being the son of William Bouchier, earl of Ewe in Normandy. He was educated at Oxford, and was chancellor of that university from 1433 to 1437. His first ecclesiastical preferment was that of dean of the collegiate church of St Martin's, London, from which, in 1433, he was advanced by Pope Eugenius IV. to the see of Worcester. Within one year of his elevation to the prelacy, the monks of Ely, on the death of their bishop, made choice of Bouchier as his successor, but the king refused his consent to the translation, and that see continued vacant for seven years, at the end of which period Bouchier succeeded in obtaining the royal consent to his removal. The author of the '*Historia Elicensis*' accuses Bouchier of neglect of duty and oppressive conduct during the time he filled that see: nevertheless, it would appear, that the monks of Canterbury, though left entirely to their own will in the matter, unanimously elected him archbishop of Canterbury, in the room of John Kemp, in 1454. Shortly after his elevation to the primacy, he was created cardinal-priest of St Cyriacus in Thermis.

The cardinal appears to have been a pious well-meaning man, but little qualified to head the church during so convulsed a period as that through which his primacy extended. Richard's sophistry prevailed on him to persuade the queen to place her infant son in his murderous uncle's hands, and he abandoned the child to his fate when his own credit and favour at court might have been endangered by any interference on his behalf. Yet, it was probably to the very mediocrity of his talents, and softness of his character, that he was indebted for his own personal preservation during the fiercest struggles of the Yorkists and Lancastrians; he saw successive princes of both parties mount the throne, and lived to perform the ceremony which united the two surviving branches of these deadly foes, having officiated at the marriage of Henry VII. and Elizabeth of York. Fuller quaintly observes, "his hand first held that sweet posie wherein the white and red roses were tied together."

Bouchier was a man of considerable learning, but we possess no works of his except a few synodical decrees. The noble art of printing lies under considerable obligations to him, if we may credit Wood, whose account, however, of the matter, is not altogether accurate. He states, that "the archbishop being informed that the inventor, Tossan, alias John Guthenberg, had set up a press at Harlem, was extremely desirous that the English should be made masters of so beneficial an art. To this purpose he persuaded King Henry VI. to despatch one

Robert Turnour, belonging to the wardrobe, privately to Harlem. This man, furnished with a thousand marks, of which the archbishop supplied three hundred, embarked for Holland; and to disguise the matter, went in company with one Caxton, a merchant of London, pretending himself to be of the same profession. Thus concealing his name and his business, he went first to Amsterdam, then to Leyden, and at last settled at Harlem; where, having spent a great deal of time and money, he sent to the king for a fresh supply, giving his highness to understand, that he had almost compassed the enterprise. In short, he persuaded Frederick Corselli, one of the compositors, to carry off a set of letters, and embark with him in the night for London. When they arrived, the archbishop, thinking Oxford a more convenient place for printing than London, sent Corselli down thither; and lest he should slip away before he had discovered the whole secret, a guard was set upon the press; and thus the mystery of printing appeared ten years sooner in the university of Oxford than at any other place in Europe, Harlem and Mentz excepted. Not long after, there were presses set up at Westminster, St Albans, Worcester, and other monasteries of note."

Archbishop Morton.

BORN A. D. 1410.—DIED A. D. 1500.

THIS eminent prelate and statesman was born at Bere in Dorsetshire in the year 1410. He studied at Oxford, where he was appointed principal of Peckwater Inn, and moderator of the civil law school. After a variety of ecclesiastical preferments, he was created archdeacon of Winchester in 1474, but in the same year was collated to the archdeaconry of Chester. His eminent abilities as a civilian recommended him to the notice of Cardinal Bouchier, who introduced him to the notice of Henry VI. In 1473 he was created bishop of Ely and lord-chancellor of England by that prince. His faithful adherence to the family of Edward IV. exposed him to the dreaded displeasure of the protector, Richard, who caused him to be apprehended on a charge of treason, but through the intercession of the university of Oxford, or some other potent advocate, was afterwards persuaded to release him, and give him in ward to the duke of Buckingham. Soon after this, he escaped from the duke's castle at Brecknock, and hastened in disguise to the continent, where he attached himself to the fortunes of Henry, earl of Richmond. It is understood to have been chiefly at the instigation of this prelate that the marriage was first suggested betwixt Henry and Edward's eldest daughter, Elizabeth, by means of which a union was ultimately effected betwixt the two rival houses of York and Lancaster.

As soon as Henry VII. was seated on the throne, preferment again flowed in upon Morton, and, on the death of Bouchier, he was elected to the primacy by the monks of Canterbury. In 1487, he was constituted lord-chancellor of England, which office he retained till his death. To the favour in which he stood with an unpopular sovereign, Morton was indebted for the dislike which the people, on more occa-

sions than one, evinced towards him ; and it does appear that the archbishop lent himself, with others of Henry's counsellors, to the unjust schemes of that monarch for enriching his private treasury. But Morton was himself a man of constant and profuse liberality. To the university of Oxford, he was at all times a munificent patron, and he expended large sums in building and repairing various public and ecclesiastical edifices within his diocese. One of the last acts of his life was to procure the canonization of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury. He died on the 15th of September, 1500, and was interred in Canterbury cathedral. His life was written by Dr John Budden, in 1607 ; Sir Thomas More, in his *Utopia*, has pronounced a high eulogium upon this prelate. His contemporaries speak of him with much respect ; and we are compelled to believe, that while he necessarily shared the odium attached to all Henry the Seventh's ministers, he acted the part of a true and faithful counsellor towards his sovereign, and often gave the king an honest opinion as to the probable effect of those measures by which the people were so grievously distressed and irritated.

Bishop Alcock.

DIED A. D. 1500.

JOHN ALCOCK, bishop of Ely and lord-high-chancellor of England, was born at Beverley in the east riding of Yorkshire. The date of his birth is not recorded ; it was probably somewhere between 1430 and 1440. He became a great favourite with Edward IV. who first made him dean of Westminster, then bishop of Rochester, in the year 1471, and afterwards keeper of the great seal in 1473. Three years after he was translated to the bishopric of Worcester, and, in 1486, to that of Ely. In the same year he was appointed by Henry VII. lord-chancellor of England.

Bale speaks in high terms of his piety and self-mortification. By others he is commended for his learning. It is difficult, however, to judge of the amount of learning possessed by any individual in those dark and illiterate times. It is certain that most of the knowledge to be any where found, was among the clergy, and, in general, the most distinguished among them were conversant merely with school divinity and the canon and civil law. There can be no doubt, however, that our bishop was highly esteemed in his day, and that his ecclesiastical and civil honours were the reward of his talents and learning. On account of his great skill and taste in architecture, Henry VII. appointed him comptroller of the royal works and buildings. While bishop of Worcester, he held the office of president of Wales. He employed his power and riches to some useful purposes. In the town of Kingston-upon-Hull, he built and endowed a grammar school and a chapel in which he was buried. At the episcopal palace of Ely, he erected the spacious hall and gallery ; but he was most famous as the founder of Jesus' college, Cambridge. Godwin, in his *Lives of the Bishops*, gives the following account of this undertaking. "It was first a monastery of nuns, dedicated to Saint Radegund, and having fallen greatly in decay, the goods and ornaments of the church wasted, the lands diminished, and the nuns themselves

having forsaken it, insomuch as only two were left, whereof one was determined to begone shortly, the other but an infant: this good bishop obtained license of King Henry VII. to convert the same to a college; wherein he placed a master, six fellows, and a certain number of scholars." The reason of the demolition of this nunnery given by Camden, is however very different. He says it was *spiritualium meretricium cœnobium*, and that Pope Julius II. with Henry VII. consented to its suppression.

The bishop died October 1st, 1500. "He lieth" says Godwin, "buried in a chappell of his own building, on the north side of the presbytery, where it is to be seen a very goodly and sumptuous tombe, erected in memory of him, which by the barbarous and dottish peevishness of somebody is pitifully defaced, the head of the image being broke off; the compartiment and other buildings torne downe."

The bishop wrote the following works: 1. 'Mons Perfectionis ad Carthusianos;' otherwise called in English the 'Mount of Perfection,' London 1501. 2. 'Galli Cantus ad Confratres suos curatos in Synado apud Barnwell,' 1498. 3. 'Abbatia Spiritus sancti in Pura Conscientia Fundata.' The same in English under the title of 'A Matere, spekjing of a place that is named the Abbaje of the Holy Ghost that shall be founded or grounded in a clene conscience, in which Abbaye shall dwelle xxix Ladyes Ghostly.' 4. 'In Psalmos Penitentiales.' 5. 'Homiliæ Vulgares.' 6. 'Meditationes Piæ.' 7. 'Spousage of a virgin to Christ' 8. 'Sermon on Jesus clamabat, qui habet aures audiendi audiat.'

Richard Fox, Bishop of Durham.

DIED A. D. 1528.

THIS eminent prelate was born towards the latter end of the reign of Henry VI., at Ropesley, near Grantham in Lincolnshire. The grammar-schools of Boston and Winchester dispute the honour of his early education. He subsequently studied first at Oxford, and then at Cambridge, from which latter university he removed to Paris, where he studied divinity and the canon law, and probably received his doctor's degree. It was during his residence in the metropolis of France that he became acquainted with Bishop Morton, and through him was introduced to the earl of Richmond, afterwards Henry VII. That nobleman thought so highly of his talents and integrity that he employed him in various missions connected with his English expedition, and rewarded his diligence therein with a seat in the privy-council and some substantial appointments, when success had crowned their exertions. In 1487, he was advanced to the see of Exeter, and appointed keeper of the privy seal. He was also, about the same time, made principal secretary of state. These various appointments threw an immense load of political business upon the bishop, and, in addition to his employments at home, he was repeatedly despatched upon foreign embassies, in all of which he acquitted himself entirely to the satisfaction of the king, who acknowledged his services by successive translations from the see of Exeter to that of Bath, and from Bath to Durham. In 1497, he bravely defended the castle of Norham, in the

latter diocese, against the Scottish forces, until the approach of Howard, earl of Surrey, compelled the assailants to retire. Shortly after this he was sent a third time into Scotland for the purpose of negotiating a treaty betwixt the two kingdoms. He discharged this embassy with his usual promptitude and success, and soon afterwards added to his many important services that of negotiating a marriage betwixt James IV. of Scotland and Margaret, Henry's eldest daughter. In 1500, he was elected chancellor of the university of Cambridge.

Between the years 1507 and 1514, he was repeatedly employed in missions to foreign courts. His last public act appears to have been that of witnessing the treaty of amity between Henry VIII. and Francis I. His political influence, however, had gradually waned since the death of Henry VII. before the ascendancy, first, of the earl of Surrey, and, afterwards, of Wolsey, who had been first introduced by Fox himself. He took leave of public life, along with Archbishop Warham, in 1515, and devoted his retirement at Winchester to acts of charity and munificence. Architecture was a favourite art of his; and Milner—an excellent judge—speaking of the repairs and alterations which the bishop executed upon his cathedral of Winchester, declares that “if the whole cathedral had been finished in the style of this portion of it, the whole island, and perhaps all Europe, could not have exhibited a Gothic structure equal to it.”¹ His last appearance in parliament was in 1523. He was then very infirm and blind; but had sufficient vigour of mind left to enable him to reprove, with dignity, the greedy and ungrateful Wolsey, who wished him to resign his bishopric to him, and accept of a pension instead of it. He died on the 14th of December, 1528. His character was that of a liberal and hospitable prelate, magnificent in his taste, and unbounded in his charities. In his political capacity he showed great aptitude for public business, and maintained a character of unimpeachable integrity. Of his writings we have only a translation of the ‘Rule of St Benedict,’ executed for the use of his diocese, and published in 1516, and a letter to Cardinal Wolsey on his intended visitation and reformation of the English dioceses. By royal license, dated 26th November, 1516, Bishop Fox founded and endowed Corpus Christi college, in the university of Oxford. In this instance, the bishop, as Mr Warton observes, made a new and noble departure from the narrow principles which had hitherto regulated academical education in England. The course of the Latin lecturer was thrown open to all the students at Oxford, and he was expressly directed to drive barbarism from the new college,—“*barbariem e nostro alveario pro virili si quando pullulet, extirpet et ejiciat.*” The Greek lecturer was also enjoined to confine his prelections to the best Greek classics, and those which the bishop specified are still allowed to furnish the purest specimen of that noble literature. With the same enlightened views, the bishop invited to his new college many of the most distinguished sons of letters then known in Europe; amongst these was Ludovicus Vives, Nicholas Crucher, Clement Edwards, Nicholas Utten, Thomas Lupset, and Richard Pace. Yet, strange to say, it was not without difficulty that the university consented to the introduction of Greek literature into its curriculum at this

¹ Hist. of Winchester, vol. ii. p. 20.

period; and the bishop was obliged to plead the authority of the council of Vienne in Dauphiny, promulged in 1311, which enjoined that professorships of Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic, should be instituted in the universities of Oxford, Paris, Bononia, Salamanca, and Rome. Nor was even this altogether satisfactory to the masters of Oxford; it required the example and persuasions of Erasmus, then residing in St Mary's college, to silence their objections and win their consent to the establishment of a Greek chair in the university.

Archbishop Warham.

DIED A. D. 1532.

THIS distinguished prelate was born of good family, at Okely, in Hampshire. He was educated at Winchester school and New college, Oxford. In 1488, he was collated to a rectorship by the bishop of Ely, and soon after became an advocate in the court of arches, and moderator of the school of civil law in St Edward's parish, Oxford. In 1493, he was associated with Sir Edward Poynings in an embassy to Philip, duke of Burgundy, to persuade him to deliver up Perkin Warbeck. The negotiation failed, and Henry was at first disposed to resent this on his ambassadors, but, soon after, we find Warham high in favour with the king, and, in 1502, made keeper of the great seal.

In the beginning of 1503, he was advanced to the see of London, having been previously created lord-high-chancellor of England. He strongly opposed the marriage of Catharine of Arragon to the king's second son, after the death of her first husband, Prince Arthur; he told the king that he thought the projected match would neither prove honourable to himself nor well-pleasing to God; but Fox's doctrine, that the pope's dispensation could remove all impediments, civil or sacred, was more pleasing to Henry, and of course prevailed.

In March, 1504, Bishop Warham was elevated to the primacy. His installation was conducted with great magnificence. In 1506, he was elected chancellor of Oxford—an honour to which he was justly entitled, by his munificent and well-directed patronage of learning. On the accession of Henry VIII. the archbishop's influence waned before that of Bishop Fox, but he held his place of chancellor for the first seven years of the new reign. The rise of Wolsey into favour also greatly contributed to lessen the archbishop's influence, and ultimately drove him altogether from public life. Warham, says Burnet, always hated Cardinal Wolsey, and would never stoop to him, esteeming it below the dignity of his see. Erasmus relates of Warham, that it was his custom to wear very plain apparel, and that when Wolsey took upon him to publish an order that all the clergy should appear richly dressed in silk or damask, at the interview of Henry and Charles, Warham, alone, despising the cardinal's injunction, attended in his usual simple garb. In December, 1515, Warham resigned the seals, and Wolsey became lord-chancellor. In 1529, on the degradation of Wolsey, the great seal was again offered to Warham, but he prudently declined, at his advanced age, again entering upon the stormy and fickle sea of politics. He, soon after this, appears to have sunk into a

state of dotage; for we find him at one time entirely duped by the silly pretences of the 'Holy Maid of Kent,' as she was called, and at another exhibiting a very silly and unmeaning protest against all the laws that had been made, or that should thereafter be made, in derogation of the authority of the pope, or to the hurt of the church's rights and privileges. He died at St Stephen's, near Canterbury, in 1532. It appears, from a letter of Erasmus to Sir Thomas More, that this prelate, notwithstanding of his having occupied the highest posts in church and state for a long series of years, had so little regarded his own private advantage that he left no more than was barely sufficient to pay his funeral charges.

Erasmus gives us a very pleasing account of Warham's private life. "That," says he, "which enabled him to go through such various cases and employments, was, that no part of his time, nor no degree of his attention, was taken up with hunting, or gaming, in idle or trifling conversation, or in luxury or voluptuousness. Instead of any diversions or amusements of this kind, he delighted in the reading of some good and pleasing author, or in the conversation of some learned man. And although he sometimes had prelates, dukes, and earls as his guests, he never spent more than an hour at dinner. The entertainment which he provided for his friends was liberal and splendid, and suitable to the dignity of his rank, but he never touched any dainties of the kind himself. He seldom tasted wine; and when he had attained the age of seventy years, drank nothing, for the most part, but a little small beer. But notwithstanding his great temperance and abstemiousness, he added to the cheerfulness and festivity of every entertainment at which he was present, by the pleasantness of his countenance, and the vivacity and agreeableness of his conversation. The same sobriety was seen in him after dinner as before. He abstained from supper altogether, unless he happened to have any very familiar friends with him, of which number I was; when he would, indeed sit down to table, but then could scarcely be said to eat any thing. If that did not happen to be the case, he employed the time by others usually appropriated to suppers, in study or devotion. But as he was remarkably agreeable and facetious in his discourse, but without biting or buffoonery, so he delighted much in jesting freely with his friends. But scurrility, defamation, or slander he abhorred and avoided as he would a snake. In this manner did this great man make his days sufficiently long, of the shortness of which many complain."

John Frith.

BORN A. D. 1506.—DIED A. D. 1533.

THIS learned and pious man was born at Westerham, in Kent. He proceeded B. A. at King's college, Cambridge, but afterwards went to Oxford, where he obtained great reputation for learning, and was chosen one of the junior canons of Cardinal Wolsey's new college. Becoming acquainted with the celebrated Tyndale, he ultimately embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, as taught by that eminent man, and, having openly avowed his new sentiments, he was imprisoned,

with some other young men of the same convictions and boldness, by the chancellor of the university. The rigour of this imprisonment was so severe that some of his companions in persecution drooped under it, but Frith ultimately obtained his release, and, about the year 1528, went abroad. He continued on the continent for about two years, and was greatly strengthened in the faith by intercourse, during that period, with many of the German and French reformers. Returning to England in 1530, he was apprehended as a common vagabond, and confined in the stocks at Reading, in Berks, where he was in danger of perishing with hunger but for the interposition of the schoolmaster of the place, who, perceiving that Frith was a scholar, and well acquainted with the classics, interested himself in his behalf, and effected his release. After this, he went to London, where he was in continual danger of apprehension by the commands of Sir Thomas More, the lord-chancellor, whose resentment was peculiarly excited against him by the circumstance of Frith having refuted one of his own publications in defence of the church of Rome. The origin of this controversy was as follows:—Simon Fish, of Gray's inn, had written a tract, entitled, 'The Supplication of the Beggars;' avowedly levelled against the system of mendicancy carried on by the Romish friars. The work was much admired by the scholars of the time, and even honoured with Henry the Eighth's approbation. But the lord-chancellor, notwithstanding, ventured to answer it in a tract, entitled, 'The Supplication of the Souls in Purgatory;' in which he defended the friars, on the ground of the value of their exertions in relieving souls from purgatory. Frith, hereupon, answered the chancellor, and boldly denied the doctrine of purgatory altogether. So daring a step marked him out for the vengeance of the church; but, for a while, he eluded all the efforts of his enemies to secure his person. At last, he was betrayed into their hands by the treachery of a false friend, who, having procured a copy of a proposition, written by Frith, against the doctrine of transubstantiation, immediately carried it to the chancellor, with information where the heretic might be apprehended. Sir Thomas instantly ordered him to be seized and sent to the Tower, where he underwent several examinations by the lord-chancellor in person. In one instance, he was brought before an assembly of bishops, convened in St Paul's cathedral, before whom he openly defended his opinions, and subscribed them in the following sentence:—"Ego Frithius ita sentio, et quemadmodum sentio, ita dixi, scripsi, asserui, et affirmavi." On this, he was pronounced incorrigible, and condemned to the fire. He suffered martyrdom at Smithfield, on the 4th of July, 1533, when only twenty-six years of age. An opportunity of making his escape had occurred some time before his condemnation, but he refused to avail himself of it, fearing that by so doing he should dishonour the gospel of Christ. Bale says that Frith was a "polished scholar, as well as master of the learned languages." And Fox assures us that Cranmer was indebted for many of his arguments in his work on the sacrament, to Frith's writings. His works were printed in London, in one folio volume, in 1573. He seems, with Tyndale and Barnes, to have leaned to Presbyterianism, so far as he had considered the question of church-government.

Elizabeth Barton.

DIED A. D. 1534.

ELIZABETH BARTON, better known as 'The Holy Maid of Kent,' was first a servant girl. She was born early in the 16th century, and resided at Aldington in Kent. In the year 1525, she was in the service of a Mr Cob or Knob, at Aldington, near Limme, formerly a port about four miles from Romney Marsh. The commencement of her delusion and imposture is traced to convulsion fits which occasionally seized her, and continued for a period of extraordinary length, and seem very much to have resembled swoons, commencing in strange agitations of her body, but the reality of which, even in their commencement, there is much reason to suspect. Reviving from one of these fits, in which it is reported she had lain for seven months, she inquired if her master's child was dead—for it was at the time lying desperately ill in its cradle,—and being answered in the negative—then said she, "it shall die anon." This, accordingly, having taken place, she was immediately viewed with superstitious dread and astonishment, although every one expected the death of the child. The ignorant and credulous multitude soon blazoned abroad the fame of this alleged prophecy, which being also patronized by the priest of the parish, soon spread through the neighbourhood in all directions. It was a happy occurrence, at that critical conjuncture, for supporting the interests of a falling church, and as such was eagerly seized by the ecclesiastics. The young woman was easily induced to turn her talents at imposture into this line. She enforced the obligation of the mass, confession, prayers to saints, with all the superstitions of the church, by her authority as one inspired. To give her admonitions and reproofs more weight, she related strange visions of things God had shown her, professed to describe what was passing in chapels or churches at a distance, and by various other delusions gained an extensive reputation as a prophetess. It was not among the vulgar alone that her imposture succeeded. The archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Warham, and Dr Fisher, bishop of Rochester, with no less a person than Sir Thomas More, were induced to believe that there was something of inspiration and miracle attending the case; and they appointed certain commissioners to inquire into it, whose report greatly contributed to the support and prevalence of the imposture. To seal the sanctity, and to secure the credit of this miracle to the service of the Romish church, Elizabeth Barton was now consecrated a nun, and a day fixed for her public entry into a chapel at Courtopstreet or Court-of-street, dedicated to the virgin. This ceremony, accordingly took place in the presence of a vast concourse of attendants of all orders. Being in the chapel, she fell into one of her fits immediately before the image, and uttered some speeches in rhythm tending to recommend the worship and service of the virgin Mary; and at the same time she said it was the will of our Lady that she (Elizabeth) should be put into some nunnery. This was accordingly complied with, and the archbishop of Canterbury ordered her to be received into Saint Sepulchres at Canterbury. Here this poor infatuated young woman

became increasingly the dupe and the tool of superstition. She continued, as it was said, to work miracles, and receive divine visions, for about eight or nine years, when an opportunity occurred of turning her impostures to political purposes. The question of King Henry the Eighth's divorce from Queen Catharine was now sharply controverted on both sides, and was violently opposed by the ecclesiastics. They accordingly called in the services of Elizabeth Barton, instructed her to denounce the king's intentions and the ecclesiastical innovations he had made. She went even so far as to declare that he would not be a king a month longer if he divorced Catharine, that he would not enjoy the favour of the Almighty, and that he would die the death of a villain. The monks disseminated everywhere the sayings of the holy maid, and one During, a friar, published a book of the revelations and prophecies of Elizabeth. Her sayings concerning the divorce were conveyed especially to the queen, whom they tended to confirm in her purpose of resisting to the utmost the king's will. But Henry VIII. was not a monarch to be overawed and ruled in his purposes by such machinations. He accordingly ordered the maid of Kent to be arrested, and all her accomplices cited before the star chamber. There she openly confessed her imposture, and with the whole party, viz. Masters, the parson of the parish where she had lived, During, Bocking, Reit, Risby, and Gold, suffered death at Paul's cross, April, 1534. Neither did the resentment of the king stop here. Fisher, bishop of Rochester, a man of ability and learning, Abel, Addison, Laurence, and some others were condemned for misprision of treason, and sentenced to confiscation of goods and imprisonment, because they had not discovered certain treasonable speeches of Elizabeth. The better to undeceive the people and discover the wicked proceedings of the priests, many of Elizabeth's impostures were exposed, and the scandalous prostitution of her manners laid open to public view. It was found that a door to her dormitory, which was said to have been miraculously opened, in order to give her free access to the chapel, for the sake of secret converse with heaven, had been contrived by Bocking and Masters, for less honourable purposes. Fisher, the bishop of Rochester, who had been cast into prison for his concealment of Elizabeth's treasons, and who had suffered many hardships there, was honoured by the pope with the rank of a cardinal; but this only inflamed the king's resentment to a higher pitch, and Fisher was in consequence impeached, tried, condemned, and beheaded; and shortly after, Sir Thomas More, who had also been imprisoned for connivances at Elizabeth's treason, was brought to the same violent and ignoble end. Thus an ignorant and base girl was not only the origin of an extensive and disgusting imposture, but the occasion of bringing several of the most distinguished men of the day, and probably the queen herself to a disgraceful and miserable end. Never was there a more barefaced, and seldom a more baneful imposture than that of 'the Holy Maid of Kent.'

Bishop Fisher.

BORN A. D. 1459.—DIED A. D. 1535.

JOHN FISHER, bishop of Rochester, was born at Beverley in Yorkshire, in the year 1459. He took his degrees at Cambridge, and was made proctor of that university in 1495. The same year he was elected master of Michael house, since incorporated with Trinity college, and soon after entered into orders. He received his first ecclesiastical elevation at the hands of Margaret, countess of Richmond, mother of Henry VII., who appointed him her chaplain and confessor, and committed herself entirely to his guidance and counsel. In 1501, he was chosen chancellor of Cambridge university, and in 1502, was appointed the lady Margaret's first professor of divinity.

In 1504, he was raised to the see of Rochester upon the recommendation of Bishop Fox. Upon Luther's appearance in opposition to popery, Fisher, ever a zealous champion for the church of Rome, was one of the first to enter the lists against him. He also did not hesitate to condemn in public the stateliness and pride with which the then all-powerful Wolsey bore himself, yet he continued to enjoy the king's favour until the business of the divorce in 1527, when his adherence to Catharine's cause and the pope's supremacy brought him into no small trouble, and ultimately proved the cause of his ruin. He also warmly opposed the first motion in parliament for the suppression of the lesser monasteries, and made himself particularly obnoxious to Henry by the warm opposition which he gave in convocation to the proposal for conferring upon the king of England the title of supreme head of the church. The affair of Elizabeth Barton was eagerly seized by his enemies as a pretext against him; but his determined refusal to take the oath of allegiance to Henry and his heirs, after his marriage with Anne Boleyn and the repudiation of Catharine, was made the capital charge against him. For this offence he was committed to the Tower in April, 1534, attainted in November, and deprived of his bishopric in the month of January following.

The unseasonable honour paid him by Pope Paul III., in creating him cardinal priest of St Vitalis, in May, 1535, sealed his fate. Secretary Cromwell being sent to him by the king to sound him on the subject, after some conference, said, "My lord of Rochester, what would you say if the pope should send you a cardinal's hat,—would you accept of it?" To which interrogatory the bishop replied in terms expressive of his unworthiness of such a distinguished honour, and the little expectation he had of it, but at the same time frankly declaring that if such a thing were to happen, he would deem himself bound to accept of the honour with all gratitude, and would endeavour to use it for the best interests of the church. When this answer was reported to Henry, he exclaimed in his own brutal style, "Yea, is he yet so lusty? Well, let the pope send him a hat when he will, mother of God! he shall wear it on his shoulders then, for I will leave him never a head to set it on." Rich, the solicitor-general, was now employed to circumvent the poor old man, which he did by visiting him in prison, and, after much affectation of friendship, drawing him into a discourse

about the supremacy. Some expressions which the bishop in his warmth let drop upon this point were eagerly noted by his treacherous visitant, and made the ground-work of his impeachment. He was found guilty of high treason on the 17th, and beheaded on the 22d of June, 1535. He met his fate with extreme fortitude.

Erasmus speaks of this prelate in very flattering terms, and, by general consent, he appears to have been a man of very high attainments for the age in literature, and of consistent morals. He was the author of several polemical pieces in defence of the peculiar doctrines of the Romish church against Luther and Ecolampadius. His writings were collected and published together at Wurtzburg, in 1595, in one volume, folio. His life by Dr Hall, under the name of Bailey, was published in 1655.

William Tyndale.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1500.—DIED A. D. 1536.

WILLIAM TINDAL, or TYNDALE, was born in or near the year 1500, somewhere upon the borders of Wales. But nothing has been preserved respecting his parentage or the place of his nativity. It is well known that the doctrines of Wickliffe had been privately disseminated to a considerable extent in South Wales, and that Sir John Oldcastle himself resided upon the borders for some time, and diligently promoted the sentiments of that celebrated reformer. It is highly probable that in his early life, Tyndale had been imbued with the spirit of reformation—for we find that almost as soon as he appeared at college, he displayed a disposition to espouse the doctrines of Luther. He first entered at Magdalen hall, Oxford, where, it is said, he very early read theological discourses in private to his fellow students. After this he removed to Wolsey's new college, called Christ's Church. Here he became still more bold, and ventured openly to profess and defend the doctrines of the Reformation. He is said to have been a person, even at this early period, of eminent abilities and of unusual learning. But his opposition to the abuses of the church could not be tolerated in Oxford, and he was, therefore, expelled before he had taken any degree. He next removed to Cambridge, where he was permitted to remain, and take a degree. From thence he went into Gloucestershire or Worcestershire, as a tutor in the family of Sir John Welsh. Here his first literary engagement, or which at least any knowledge has descended to later times, was a translation of the 'Enchiridion Militis Christiani' of Erasmus. It was intended for the religious benefit of the family in which he resided. During this period of his life, it appears that he found frequent opportunities of preaching, and especially in the city of Bristol. It is recorded that he stood high in the estimation of Sir John Welsh, and of many others in his neighbourhood. Indeed it may well be conjectured, that so learned and zealous a reformer would extensively recommend the truth, in an age of darkness and corruption. But it is no less obvious that, in doing so, he would expose himself to the malice of those whose interests were implicated in the errors and corruptions of the times. We find accordingly, that Tyndale made himself odious to some

of the ecclesiastical visitors at Sir John Welsh's, by entering boldly into theological discussion with them. The effect was a general prejudice raised against him as a heretic, and at length, an impeachment by the chancellor of the diocese. Tyndale, however, appeared with great courage to answer to the articles of impeachment, and defended himself with such vigour and ability that his adversaries were confounded and constrained to release him. This defeat only deepened their resolution of revenge. Their purpose of crushing him was merely held in check for a time, not abandoned. They resorted to a system of perpetual annoyance and oppression, and at length compelled him to leave the country and repair to London. Here, however, he enjoyed ample opportunities of becoming acquainted with the extensive and insupportable corruptions of the church, as well as with the extreme ignorance and incompetence of the clergy. During this period he occasionally preached at St Dunstan in the West, and often engaged in disputation with the defenders of popery. He was known frequently to challenge, in the boldness and confidence of truth, the blind guides of the day, and to declare that the period was approaching when the rudest peasant with the Bible in his hand, would be superior to the best of them in that knowledge which leads to everlasting life. At this early period, Tyndale had amassed a knowledge of the holy scriptures and of collateral learning possessed by few at that day, and this gave him an amazing advantage in all his controversies with the priesthood, few of whom had ever read the scriptures, and many of whom had never seen a single copy of them in their lives. It was during his residence in London, that he formed the determination of translating the Scriptures into English, and commenced its execution. He knew well the danger of such an undertaking; he was well aware of the opposition excited against Wickliffe, and the final miscarriage of all his labours in the same project, through the malignity of the bishops and clergy nearly a century before. But he was not to be scared from his undertaking by threats, nor defeated by trifling difficulties. He proceeded to collect his materials with much care and judgment, and to communicate his purpose to his friends. He embraced the object with all the ardour of an enthusiast, and pursued it with the heroism of a martyr. While he was advancing with his translation of the Scriptures, he endeavoured to obtain an appointment under Bishop Tunstal, whom Erasmus had praised as an eminent scholar; and on applying to that prelate for a chaplainship, as a proof of his qualifications, he produced an English translation of an oration of Isocrates. But in this attempt he was unsuccessful, and after his failure retired into privacy for about half a year, to complete his translation of the New Testament. He employed unwearied assiduity in perfecting this great work, in which it will be readily believed, he found little help in the learning of the age, and scarcely a friend who would venture to become a coadjutor or even sanction the undertaking. Having alone accomplished his task, he looked around him for the means of publication, but finding none, and discovering that the attempt would expose him to imminent danger at home, he resolved to seek an asylum among the reformers of the continent. To enable him to effect his purpose, providence raised him up a friend in Henry Monmouth, who supplied him with money, and thereby enabled him to leave London. Abroad, he speedily obtained

the acquaintance of Luther, and other learned men, who sanctioned his preaching among his own countrymen at Antwerp and its vicinity. In 1526, he obtained the friendship and assistance of John Frith, a learned Englishman, by whose assistance he was encouraged to publish the first edition of his New Testament. It appeared in small octavo without a name. Fifteen hundred were first published. These were brought into England and privately circulated. The clergy were mightily displeased at this attempt. The utmost diligence was used in endeavouring to collect and destroy the copies. But the more it was condemned the more eagerly was it sought after and read; insomuch that the Dutch booksellers printed and sold four editions of it without the sanction of Tyndale. While they were thus making a gain of his labours, he was proceeding with a translation of the five books of Moses, with the intention of their publication. After the disgrace of Cardinal Wolsey, who had suffered no person to be persecuted for heresy while he was in power, Sir Thomas More persuaded the king to enforce the laws against heresy, and to prevent the importation of books from the continent. Toustal also collected what copies of Tyndale's Testament could be collected, and had them burnt by the hands of the common hangman in Cheapside.

There is a curious and interesting circumstance related of Toustal in reference to the labours of Tyndale, which among the few facts of Tyndale's history ought to be preserved. Being at Antwerp in the year 1529, the bishop sent for an English merchant of the name of Packington, and inquired of him how many copies of Tyndale's New Testament he could purchase. The merchant immediately made Tyndale acquainted with the bishop's proposal. Being poor and in want of the means of publishing a new and revised edition, he immediately contracted for the sale of all his remaining copies. For these he received ready money; the books were brought to England and destroyed, but a new and corrected edition was speedily on sale. This occasioned much merriment at the expense of the bishop. For, Sir Thomas More inquiring who encouraged and supported Tyndale, was told, it was the bishop of London. In order to check all similar efforts and to discourage Tyndale in his further proceedings, Sir Thomas ridiculed the version in a dialogue which was published in 1529. To this Tyndale wrote a large and able reply, but with little effect upon the mind of his enemies at home; for in a court of the star-chamber, the king, with the concurrence of the universities, the clergy and bishops, condemned and prohibited his version as heretical.

Undaunted by these efforts to repress his labours, he proceeded with his translations from the Old Testament; but in removing about this period by sea to Hamburgh, was shipwrecked and lost all his books, manuscripts and money. Having, however, in the midst of all these difficulties made his way to Hamburgh, he met with Miles Coverdale, who was also engaged in the translation of the scriptures. They became intimate friends, and proceeded together to accomplish a new translation of the Pentateuch, which they published at Marburg about 1530. It is doubtful whether they made their translation from the Vulgate Latin or from the Hebrew. If they took the Vulgate as their text, it is probable that they consulted the Hebrew in the case of difficulties; but it is questioned whether they were sufficiently masters of that

language to make their version directly from it, without the intervention of a version.

These labours, with the occasional revision of his New Testament, occupied Tyndale till the year 1534. The fourth surreptitious edition of his Testament, which was published before his own second, was superintended by one George Joy, a Bedfordshire man, who made some alterations. This edition was printed at Antwerp in August, 1534. Tyndale had by this time proceeded in the Old Testament as far as Nehemiah. But while he was thus advancing in his benevolent efforts, his former friend and fellow-labourer, John Frith, was seized in England and cast into the Tower, and some time after, a secret plan was formed for effecting the destruction of Tyndale. It will excite no astonishment that so accomplished an advocate of the Reformation, so able a translator of that book which the church of Rome has always deeply feared and pertinaciously kept from the people, that so intrepid a foe to ecclesiastical corruptions and abominations, should become the object of universal hatred and of an exterminating rancour which could never rest till it found the means of entire satisfaction.

Having removed back from Hamburgh to Antwerp, Tyndale formed an acquaintance with one Henry Phillips, employed, it is said, by the English bishops, for the purpose of luring Tyndale to his destruction. After Phillips had lived with him for many months, he went secretly to Brussels and obtained the sanction and aid of imperial authority. He returned to Antwerp with the emperor's attorney and other officers. He next invited Tyndale out to dinner, and waited himself to accompany his friend. Accepting this invitation with some reluctance, the good man left his house in company with Phillips, who, on passing the threshold, gave a sign like Judas to the officers. Rushing upon their victim with furious haste they dragged him instantly away. The same day the emperor's attorney took possession of all his papers and effects. From Antwerp he was conveyed to the castle of Filford, where he remained a year and six months in close confinement. During this time the utmost exertions were made by the English merchants at Antwerp, by a person of the name of Poyntz with whom he had lodged, and by others to obtain his release. Lord Cromwell also wrote to the emperor to the same effect, but all to no purpose. Tyndale's fidelity and composure were, however, nothing shaken by these persecutions. He pursued his reforming labours even in prison, and made converts of his gaoler and several of his family. At length he was brought to trial at Augsburgh, and condemned to be strangled and burnt: the sentence was carried into effect in the year 1536. The last words he uttered were, "Lord, open the king of England's eyes."

He lived for the benefit of mankind, and died a martyr in the cause of religion. Of his character, his enemies have left a memorial with which his friends might be satisfied, that he was "*homo doctus, pius, et bonus.*" His life and manners were pure and blameless, yet he died by the hands of Christians for promoting the use of that document which is the foundation of their religion. In his preface to the New Testament, he writes, "I call God to witness, when I shall appear at the judgment seat of Christ, to give an account of all my actions, that I have not altered one syllable of God's word against my conscience, nor would I for all the honours of this world, if they were laid at my feet."

The pedigree of our authorized version is no doubt to be traced back to Tyndale. It appears indeed that there never has been an entirely new translation of the Bible since the days of Coverdale and Tyndale. Different editions have from time to time been sent out, with some alterations, made under authority, but for the basis of the text we are indebted at the present day to these two humble individuals, and chiefly to Tyndale—a man who so ardently desired to communicate to his countrymen the knowledge of the word of God, that he continually hazarded his life and all his earthly comforts in endeavouring to effect it, and at last paid the awful price of martyrdom for his benevolence.

His other works, which were published and read with great avidity, were, 1. 'The obedience of a Christian man.' 2. 'The wicked Mammon.' 3. 'The practice of Prelates.' 4. 'An answer to Sir Thomas More.' 5. 'Expositions of Important passages of Scripture' and some smaller works. All his pieces were collected and printed with those of Frith and Barnes, in one vol. folio, 1572. Dr Geddes speaks in high terms of the version by Tyndale, and thinks that in point of perspicuity and noble simplicity it has never been surpassed. The whole works of Tyndale, including his prologues to his several translations of the books of scripture with numerous entertaining and illustrative notes, have been reprinted in the 'English and Scottish Reformers,' edited by Rev. T. Russell.¹

John Bradford.

DIED A. D. 1555.

THIS eminent martyr was born at Manchester, in Lancashire. In early life he became steward of the household to Sir John Harrington, but, on imbibing the pure doctrines of the gospel from some of the foreign protestants then in England, he resolved to dedicate his future life to the service of preaching Christ. He accordingly went to Cambridge, and, after due attendance, was chosen fellow of Pembroke hall. His principal tutor, while at the university, was Martin Bucer, who soon discovered the worth of his pupil, and greatly assisted and encouraged him in his preparations for the ministry. On taking orders, he was presented by Dr Ridley, then bishop of London, with a prebendal stall in St Paul's. Immediately after Mary's accession, Bradford was committed to the Tower, and, on the 22d of January, 1555, he was brought before the commissioners appointed for his trial. At the close of the examination, the lord-chancellor offered mercy if the prisoner would accept of it on the queen's terms; whereupon Bradford replied, "Mercy, with God's mercy, should be welcome; but otherwise I will have none." His execution took place at Smithfield on the 1st of July, 1555. During his imprisonment, he chiefly occupied himself in preaching to the other prisoners, and to those who, attracted by the fame of his extraordinary gifts as a preacher and expounder of the scriptures, crowded to hear him in the Poultry Compter, by permission of the gaoler. He also devoted much of his

¹ Fox's Acts and Monuments.—Middleton.—Lives of the Reformers.

time to the compilation of hortatory epistles to his brethren in faith and suffering, especially to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, then in bonds at Oxford, with whom he was particularly anxious to come to a sound and unanimous decision upon some points of faith.

Hugh Latimer.

BORN A. D. 1470.—DIED A. D. 1555.

HUGH LATIMER was the son of a respectable yeoman, and was born at Thurstaston, in Leicestershire, in the year 1470.¹ He received his early education in a country school, and at the age of fourteen was removed to Cambridge. He was brought up a zealous Romanist, but becoming acquainted with Mr Thomas Bilney at Cambridge, he gradually changed his opinions, and, being of an ardent and ingenuous disposition, he became a zealous promoter of the protestant doctrines. He first attracted the notice of the papists by a series of discourses, in which he enforced the uncertainty of tradition, the vanity of works of supererogation, and the pride and pomp of the Roman hierarchy. These discourses were attacked by Buckenham with great warmth. Buckenham was prior of the Black friars at Cambridge, then the seat of ignorance, bigotry, and superstition. Latimer opposed him with great zeal and acuteness, and greatly advanced the protestant interest at Cambridge. The unaffected piety of Mr Bilney, and the pungent and cheerful eloquence of honest Latimer, wrought so much on the junior students, and so greatly increased the credit of the protestants, that the popish clergy were alarmed, and, according to their usual practice, called aloud for the secular arm. The bishop of Ely interdicted his preaching within the jurisdiction of the university; the order was defeated by Dr Barnes, prior of the Augustines, who being friendly to the Reformation, boldly licensed Latimer to preach in his chapel, which was exempt from episcopal interference. At length the progress of the new opinions was represented to Cardinal Wolsey, who, at the importunity of Archbishop Warham, created a court of bishops and deacons to put the laws in execution against heretics. Before this court Bilney and Latimer were summoned, and the former, who was considered the principal, being induced to recant, the whole were set at liberty; and such was the favour extended to Latimer, that he was licensed by the bishop of London to preach throughout England. Bilney was filled with such deep remorse, on account of his recantation, that he afterwards disclaimed his abjuration, and sought the stake, which so excited the rage of his enemies, that he was speedily doomed to martyrdom, and suffered it at Norwich in 1531. His suffering did not shake the reformation at Cambridge, but rather inspired the leaders thereof with fresh courage. Latimer was roused to more exertion, and filled that place which Bilney had occupied in this important work. So far was Latimer from being intimidated by the sufferings of his friend, that he wrote to King Henry VIII. against a proclamation then just published, forbidding the use of the Bible in Eng-

¹ Fox says 1475.

lish, and of other books on religious subjects. He had preached before his majesty once or twice at Windsor, and had been noticed by him in a more affable manner than that monarch usually indulged towards his subjects. But whatever hopes of preferment his sovereign's favour might have raised, he chose to hazard all rather than to omit what he thought to be his duty. Although this epistle did not produce the desired effect, Henry, who loved openness, took it in good part, and presented him to the living of West Kington, in Wiltshire. This mark of royal favour was doubtless, in some degree, to be attributed to the influence of Lord Cromwell, who was now become a favourite with Henry, and who was a friend to the Reformation.

The ascendancy of Anne Boleyn proved still more favourable to Latimer, who went, immediately after his presentation, to reside on his benefice, where he discharged his duty in a very zealous and conscientious manner, though much persecuted by the Romish clergy. At length the malice of his enemies obtained an archiepiscopal citation for his appearance in London. His friends advised him to flee; but their persuasions were in vain. He set out for London in the depth of winter, under a severe fit of the stone and cholic, but he was more distressed at the thought of leaving his parish exposed to the popish clergy, than at the prospect of his own troubles. On his arrival in London, he found a court of bishops ready to receive him. Instead of being examined, as he expected, about his sermons, a paper was put into his hand, which he was ordered to subscribe, declarative of his belief in the efficacy of masses for souls in purgatory, of prayers to dead saints, of pilgrimages to their sepulchres and reliques, the pope's power to forgive sins, the doctrine of merit, the seven sacraments, and the worship of images. When he refused to sign, the archbishop, with a frown, begged he would consider what he did. The next day, and frequently afterwards, this scene was renewed and continued. He continued inflexible, and they continued to distress him. They regularly sent for him three times on every week, with a view to wear out his patience and tease him into a compliance. Tired with this usage, at length he sent a remonstrance to the bishop, which was truly characteristic of the faithfulness and boldness of his character. The bishops continued their persecutions until their schemes were frustrated in an unexpected manner, by Latimer being raised to the see of Worcester, in 1535, by the favour of Queen Anne Boleyn, to whom he had been recommended by Lord Cromwell. He had now a more extensive field to promote the principles of the Reformation, in which he laboured with the utmost pains and assiduity. All the historians of the day mention him as a person remarkably zealous in the discharge of his official duties, and whose fidelity could not be seduced by smiles nor terrified by frowns. One remarkable instance of his courage in administering seasonable reproof is much to his honour. It was customary for the bishops to make presents to the king on the new-year's-day. Latimer on this occasion presented his majesty with a New Testament, having the leaf turned down to this passage,—“Whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.” King Henry was not offended; and, on an occasion soon after, when Latimer was brought before him to answer for some passages in a sermon he had preached at court, his honest defence so pleased the king that he dismissed him with a smile.

The fall of Anne Boleyn was followed by great changes. The aspect of spiritual affairs was much altered: the six articles were carried in parliament. Latimer chose to resign his bishopric rather than to hold any preferment in a church which enforced such terms of communion, and retired into the country. He remained in this seclusion until obliged to visit London to obtain medical advice, in consequence of an injury he had sustained from the falling of a tree. He was discovered by the crafty and bigoted Gardiner, and imprisoned during the continuance of Henry's reign. The death of Henry, and the consequent accession of the lovely Edward VI. was the dawn of a bright and auspicious day for the reformed cause. Latimer was released from confinement, and was much admired and followed for the ardour and evangelical strain of his preaching, through the whole of this short reign. He could not be prevailed on to resume his episcopal functions, although much solicited, and at length, when it was found that his resolution was fixed, he took up his abode with Archbishop Cranmer at Lambeth. Soon after Mary ascended the throne, this eminent confessor was cited to appear before the council. He might have made his escape had he been so disposed, as opportunity was afforded him to leave the country; he did not consider it his duty to fly from the storm, and prepared with alacrity to obey the citation, and as he passed through Smithfield, he exclaimed, "This place has long groaned for me!" Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Ridley were also committed to the Tower, which was so crowded with prisoners that the three prelates were confined in the same room. This was a most providential circumstance, as it afforded these holy men an opportunity of much conversation on the subjects in dispute between the reformers and the papists; and the three fellow-prisoners for Christ's sake searched the sacred volume together, and confirmed each other in the truths for which they were so soon to bear a martyr's testimony, and, by their mutual prayers, strengthened each other's faith and hope. They were soon after removed from the Tower to Oxford, and confined in the common prison, and underwent every kind of degradation, preparatory to a mock disputation, in which Latimer behaved with his usual intrepidity and simplicity, and refused to deliver any thing more than a free confession of his opinions. His mind had been long prepared for the worst that man could do unto him, and his regard for the great cause which he had espoused rendered him a cheerful sacrifice. Many months intervened between the sentence passed by his judge and the final catastrophe, during which time the three prelates remained in gaol, chiefly because the statutes under which they had been tried had been formally repealed. In the next year, 1555, new and more sanguinary laws were enacted in support of the Romish religion, and a commission was issued by Cardinal Pole, the pope's legate, to try Latimer and Ridley for heresy. Much pains were taken, during the second trial, to induce them to sign articles of subscription: this they steadfastly refused, and were delivered over to the secular arm, and condemned to the flames. They suffered on the 16th October, 1555. At the place of execution, having thrown off the old gown which was wrapped around him, Latimer appeared in a shroud prepared for the purpose, and, with his companion in tribulation, was fastened to the stake. When a burning faggot was placed at the feet of Bishop Ridley,

Latimer exclaimed, "Be of good comfort Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as, I trust, shall never be put out!" Having commended his soul into the hands of the Redeemer, he endured the fire with a holy serenity and fortitude of mind, and his sufferings were speedily terminated. Thus, being offered up on the altar of the gospel, as a freewill offering, his soul ascended as in a fiery chariot, while the body was consumed and refined. Such a character as Latimer does not appear in every age. The natural fortitude and courage with which he was endowed, when sanctified and elevated by the spirit of the gospel, rendered him a noble champion for the truth,—the British Luther. His talents as a preacher were peculiarly adapted to the day in which he lived; pungent, clear, lively, and evangelical, he arrested the attention, commanded the respect, and awed the conscience of his hearers, and at all times appeared to aim to save himself and them that heard him. No considerations of personal vanity, or of the dignity of his auditory, prevented him from speaking with godly simplicity, or from commending himself to every man's conscience, in the sight of God. No man had more powerfully felt the truth both to convince and to relieve the conscience, and he spake from the heart, without being influenced by the fear of man. No monumental pillar points to the spot where his mortal remains repose in quiet slumber till the resurrection morning, but a memorial more durable than marble records his worth and the exploits of his faith; and the decisive day will prove that the precious dust, which was consumed on his funeral pile, and carried up in clouds of sacred perfume, was the care of him who had said, "he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." "I will raise him up at the last day." A collection of his sermons, printed in 1570, and since frequently republished, remains only of his literary works.

Bishop Ridley.

DIED A. D. 1555.

NICHOLAS RIDLEY was born in the early part of the 16th century, at Willymondswick in Northumberland. Having passed through the grammar-school at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, he was entered of Pembroke hall, Cambridge, about the year 1518. On finishing his ecclesiastical studies here, he went to the Sorbonne at Paris, then the most celebrated school in Europe, and afterwards spent some time at Louvain. On his return to Cambridge, he was chosen senior proctor of the university; and in 1534, he took the degree of bachelor in divinity, and was chosen public preacher. The reputation which he acquired in the latter office procured for him the patronage of Cranmer, who appointed him one of his chaplains, and soon after collated him to the vicarage of Herne in Kent. In the latter situation he bore his testimony in the pulpit against the six articles, and instructed his charge in the pure doctrines of the gospel as far as they were yet discovered to him; but transubstantiation continued to form an article of his creed, until his faith on this point was shaken by the various writings which the con-

tinental divines had published on the sacramental controversy, and finally overturned by the perusal of a small treatise by Ratramnus or Bertram, a monk of Corbey, written at the request of Charles the Bald, about the year 840, and republished at Cologne in 1532. In the close of the year 1545, Cranmer presented his friend with a stall in St Peter's, Westminster; and soon after the accession of Edward VI., he was presented by his majesty to the living of Soham, in the diocese of Norwich.

On the 4th of September, 1547, he was promoted to the bishopric of Rochester. Next year he appears to have been employed in compiling the book of common prayer in conjunction with Cranmer. On the deprivation of Bonner, Ridley was appointed bishop of London. His conduct to the deprived prelate and his family, on this occasion, was exceedingly urbane, and highly honourable to his integrity and benevolence. Soon after his promotion to the see of London, we find him again associated with Cranmer in promoting the doctrinal reformation of the church, by preparing the book of articles of faith which was afterwards published by royal authority.

Upon the accession of Mary, Ridley was sent to the Tower, and after eight months' imprisonment, was taken to Oxford, where, on the 1st of October, 1555, he was condemned for heresy. He conducted himself with great firmness before his judges, and resisted all attempts to extort a recantation from him. He suffered death on the same day with his friend Latimer, and met his fate, if it were possible, with even more firmness and triumph than his companion. Anthony Wood says of Bishop Ridley, that he was "a person of small stature, but great in learning, and profound in divinity." He wrote several treatises, amongst which are, 'A treatise concerning Images not to be set up nor worshipped in Churches;' 'A brief declaration of the Lord's Supper;' 'A comparison between the comfortable doctrine of the Gospel, and the Traditions of Popish Religion;' 'Injunctions to his Diocese;' and 'A Letter of Reconciliation to Bishop Hooper.' His life has been written by his relative, Dr Gloster Ridley.

Bishop Hooper.

BORN A. D. 1495.—DIED A. D. 1555.

JOHN HOOPER, a prelate of the church of England, and martyr in the cause of protestantism, was born in Somersetshire, in or about the year 1495. He received his education at the university of Oxford, where it is believed he was entered of Merton college, and took his first degree in the year 1518. After his college course was completed he entered into a society of White friars, called Cistercians, but continued only a few years connected with this fraternity. It is highly probable that an insight into their manners and principles disgusted him, and determined his secession from them. He now returned to the university, and about this period the works of the German reformers were beginning to be privately introduced at the English universities. These he procured and eagerly read. They induced a thirst for the sacred Scriptures, and by the perusal of both, he soon became in heart

a protestant. After he had once cordially embraced the principles of protestantism he found it necessary to confess them, and this of course drew upon him the jealousy of the popish party. When the statute of the six articles, as it was called, was ordered to be enforced upon the members of the university, he soon perceived that the attempt to maintain his standing was hopeless, and that it would be the wiser part to withdraw before the storm overtook him. He found an asylum in the house of Sir Thomas Arundel as his steward and chaplain. But here he was not long safe from the cruel vigilance of his enemies. He, however, again foresaw the deadly nature of the storm that was gathering, and betook himself to flight. But not finding the reformers of France quite to his mind, after a short time he returned to England, and lived with a gentleman of the name of Saintlow. Before he had been long in this retreat, his enemies again discovered him, and were taking steps to have him apprehended, when he narrowly escaped their hands again by assuming the character of a sailor, and as master of a small vessel bound to Ireland, made good his escape.

From Ireland he passed over to France, and thence into Switzerland. There he met with a joyful welcome from the principal reformers, among whom were Bulinger and Zuingli. During his residence in Switzerland, he applied himself closely to the study of the Hebrew language and the Scriptures. Here also he married a lady, a native of Burgundy. At this period an important question greatly agitated the protestants of Germany and Switzerland. It arose out of the enforcement of a system called the *Interim*, which was a sort of modified and chastened popery which Charles V. was determined to have enforced upon the members of both protestant and popish communions. This measure made extensive inroads upon the advancing protestantism of the continent, as many found it an excuse for complying, and thereby avoiding the terrors of persecution. Melancthon was at the head of the conformists, and he was followed by many of the Lutherans. At Zurich, where Hooper dwelt, this subject was taken up with much zeal. The reformers there were decidedly opposed to the *Interim*, and zealously protested against all conformity to the old popish rites. In these sentiments Hooper fully concurred. Upon the death of Henry VIII., Hooper returned into England, and was actively employed in preaching and explaining the Scriptures, principally in London. He became exceedingly popular, and was engaged in preaching every day in the week. The churches were crowded to hear him, and his fame soon introduced him to court. He was then commissioned to preach the doctrines of the Reformation through Kent and Essex, and endeavour to reconcile the people to the reformed church. He next appeared as the accuser of the persecuting Bonner, when measures were taken to deprive him of his bishopric, but who subsequently found an opportunity of taking cruel and ample revenge.

Such was the advancing fame and influence of Hooper, that, in 1550, he was appointed bishop of Gloucester. But he refused the office on account of the objections which he had to the form of the oath of supremacy, which he calls foul and impious, and because of the garments which he denounced as popish. The oath required him to swear by the saints, which he denominated impious. The young king was so convinced of the justness of Hooper's objection, that he struck out the

words with his own pen, but the habits were not to be so easily laid aside. The king and council were willing to have them dispensed with in the ordination of Hooper, but Ridley and Cranmer were sticklers for their enforcement. Ridley was deputed to confer with him, and bring him to a compliance; but failing in the attempt, the archbishop next undertook the task. But neither could Cranmer succeed with this resolute nonconformist. The *unprotestant* protestant prelates next proceeded to try the argument of imprisonment, and Hooper was sent to the Fleet. Having remained in prison several months, the matter was compromised, and he was consecrated. He consented to wear the vestments at the consecration, when he preached before the king, and when he appeared in his own cathedral, but was allowed to lay them aside on all other occasions.¹

After the consecration, Hooper was appointed to preach before the king, when, for the first time, he made his appearance in his canonical habits: he then hastened to his diocese, where he set himself to the discharge of its duties with exemplary and primitive zeal. His preaching attracted vast crowds who were greatly instructed by his labours. In this branch of his duty he was incessant and unwearied. He usually preached twice, and often three times a day. His life was in all respects a pattern of his instructions, and a living sermon louder and more impressive than his discourses. His charity was liberal and generous in the highest degree, and greatly recommended the Gospel which he taught. On the deprivation of Heath, bishop of Worcester, which occurred in 1552, Hooper was presented with that see *in commendam* with Gloucester. This enlargement of his sphere of duty greatly extended his usefulness, and induced him to the most zealous and laborious exertions, often beyond his strength. The period of his happy labours was, however, soon cut short by the succession of Mary to the throne. The year after his induction to Worcester, the queen sent a messenger to bring him up to London, to answer the charges which were laid against him by Heath the deprived bishop, and by Bonner, who alleged that he had falsely accused him in the late reign. Upon his appearance before the council, he was first charged with detaining from the queen certain sums of money which were due to her. Upon these pretences he was first ordered to be committed to the Fleet. These charges were however speedily abandoned, and the more serious one of heresy substituted in their place. In the prison he was kept eighteen months, being constantly harassed by the most wanton cruelty, and exposed to the grossest impositions. During this imprisonment he was cited frequently before the council, when the charge of heresy was urged against him, enforced by the most savage threatenings and revilings. He was called upon again and again to recant. His defection from protestantism was looked upon as a most desirable and important object on account of the extensive influence it would have upon the

¹ It is a curious fact, that the history of this cruel treatment of Hooper by his brother protestants, which is given by Fox in the Latin edition of the Acts and Monuments, is omitted in all the English editions; it is as follows:—"Thus ended this theological quarrel in the victory of the bishops, Hooper being forced to recant; or to say the least, being constrained to appear once in public, attired after the manner of the other bishops; which, unless he had done, there are those who think the bishops would have endeavoured to take away his life; for his servant told me, the duke of Suffolk sent such word to Hooper, who was not himself ignorant of what they were doing."

people, but he continued invincible. Finding that he adhered most rigidly and courageously to his principles, they condemned him to be degraded from his episcopal and ecclesiastical functions, and then delivered over to the secular power to be dealt with as a traitorous and disobedient subject of the realm. Under this sentence he was removed from the Fleet to Newgate, where he was placed more directly under the influence of Bonner and his chaplains. Every means was essayed which hope or fear could supply, or which threats and promises could enforce. Riches and honours were at his command if he would recant, but tortures and ignominy and death must be his lot if he persisted in his heresy. But still finding that every effort was powerless, and that his conscience was neither to be bribed nor scared, they resolved at least to avail themselves and their cause of the influence of his name and popularity. They pretended that he had recanted, and in order to destroy the cause of protestantism and counteract the influence of his name and example, gave the utmost publicity to this foul and infamous slander. But it was soon announced to Hooper, that such a report was industriously circulated, and he accordingly took the bold step of writing to his friends, to assure them and the public, that he was unaltered in his principles, and indeed more than ever attached to the protestant faith. The popish bishops, Gardiner and Bonner, were so stung by this spirited exposure of their falsehood and artifice, that they instantly determined upon visiting him with the ultimate degree of their cruelty and wrath. They found that Hooper was never to be won again to the abjured doctrines of Rome, and that so long as he survived, there would exist a formidable impediment to their schemes both of secular and ecclesiastical ambition. Bonner therefore, whose promptitude in all acts of cruelty and oppression has entitled him to an execrable pre-eminence among persecutors, hearing of the denial that Hooper had sent abroad, of any such recantation as the bishops had published, went immediately to Newgate, and there went through the solemn farce of degrading and depriving him of his orders as a priest, for already he had been discarded as a bishop. The very next day he was ordered to be sent under care of a troop of horse to Gloucester. Here he was to be brought to the stake under circumstances which, as they imagined, would most deeply afflict him, and afford the bitterest anguish to his numerous and attached flock in the city and its neighbourhood. On his arrival at Gloucester, the whole city assembled to show him respect and weep over his fate. Sir Anthony Kingston implored him to save himself, and consider the possible usefulness of future life—saying, “Life is sweet and death is bitter; therefore, seeing life may be had, desire to live, for life hereafter may do good.” But the good bishop replied, “Indeed I am come here to end this life, and to suffer death, because I will not gainsay the former truth that I have taught in this diocese and elsewhere. I do not so much regard this death, nor esteem this life; but have settled myself, through the strength of God’s holy Spirit, patiently to pass through the torments and extremities of the fire now prepared for me, rather than deny the truth of his word.”

The next day, being the market day, he was brought to the stake, amidst a vast concourse of people. The execution of the horrid sentence was attended with the utmost barbarity, the wood being quite

green and long before it would burn. While he was engaged in prayer a stool was placed before him, on which a box was set, with the queen's pardon within it—if he would recant. When he beheld it he cried out—"If you love my soul, away with it! If you love my soul, away with it!" After the fire was lighted he was kept in the utmost tortures for three quarters of an hour, his lower extremities being burnt away slowly before there was fire enough to affect the vitals. At length he expired, crying out, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!" His martyrdom took place on the 9th of February, 1555, in the sixtieth year of his age.

He was the author of numerous controversial tracts, sermons, homilies, law lectures, confessions, letters, &c. Several of his smaller pieces are preserved in Fox's Acts, &c.¹

Archbishop Cranmer.

BORN A. D. 1489.—DIED A. D. 1556.

THOMAS CRANMER, the first protestant archbishop of Canterbury, and one of the fathers of the English Reformation, was born of an ancient and respectable family of Nottinghamshire, at Aslacton in that county, on the 2d of July, 1489. He received the rudiments of education at the grammar school of his native village, under a rude and harsh master, "of whom he learned little and endured much." At the age of fourteen he was entered of Jesus college, Cambridge, where he continued sixteen years. The first half of this period he mispent upon the scholastic logic of Duns and other celebrated questionists; the next four years he turned to more profitable account in the study of Faber, Erasmus, and other good Latin authors; and latterly he gave his undivided attention to the study of the scriptures. It does not appear, however, that he was originally intended for the church, for he is said to have excelled in the more profane accomplishments of a gentleman of that age, such as hunting and hawking, and he married before he took orders. His wife died in child-birth within a year after her marriage,—a circumstance which enabled him to resume the fellowship which he had forfeited by entering into wedlock. From this period he appears to have directed his views towards the church. In 1523, he took the degree of doctor in divinity, and soon after became reader of the divinity lectures in his own college, and one of the examiners of candidates for holy orders. In the latter capacity he made an accurate knowledge of the scriptures indispensable to all candidates. The enforcement of this measure was not without difficulty. School divinity had hitherto been the sole study of those intended for the clerical profession, and the monastic orders in particular were zealously opposed to any innovations upon the established practice in this respect; but the firmness and affability of the new examiner prevailed, and he soon won the universal esteem of all whom his new office brought him in contact with.

In 1529, the 'sweating sickness' having broken out in Cambridge, Cranmer retired to the abode of a friend at Waltham abbey in Essex.

¹ Middleton.—Neal.—Burnett's Reformation.—Wood's Athen. Oxon.

It happened that Henry VIII. at this time spent a night at Waltham, and the royal suite being billeted in the different houses in the neighbourhood, his secretary Gardiner, and his almoner Fox, were allotted to the house in which Cranmer was then a resident. The conversation at supper soon turned upon the all-absorbing object of public interest, the king's divorce, and Cranmer being pressed for his opinion, expressed himself in favour of committing it as a question of conscience and religion, in which the truth is one, to the discussion and decision of competent divines. This opinion was soon after reported to the king, who was so much pleased with it that he exclaimed, "The man has got the sow by the right ear!" and immediately sent for him to court. In his conference with the king, he gave so much satisfaction that he was immediately appointed one of the royal chaplains, and placed in the family of the earl of Wiltshire, the father of Anne Boleyn. The king also commanded him to write a treatise upon the subject of the divorce. From this moment Cranmer was considered as a 'rising churchman,' and some discerning spirits already perceived in him the probable successor of Wolsey, now in the first stage of his fall.

Having finished his treatise on the divorce, in which he mainly argued against the pope's power of granting a dispensation for the marriage of Henry with his brother's widow, Cranmer received the royal commands to take the opinion of the learned upon the question agreeably to the plan which he had himself suggested. He began with his own university, where he at first met with but indifferent success, although he succeeded in changing the minds of a few leading men, and both universities afterwards determined against the dispensing power of the pope. He met with better success, however, in his consultations with the divines of France, Italy, and Germany, a majority of whom decided in favour of the king's wishes. He was then deputed with the earl of Wiltshire, to the papal court, to submit to his holiness the opinions of the learned, and to obtain the papal sanction for the intended divorce. On his arrival in Rome, he presented his treatise to the pope, and offered to defend in public its two principal points, namely, that no man, *jure divino*, could or ought to marry his brother's wife, and that the bishop of Rome had no power to dispense to the contrary. The pontiff declined to sanction a public disputation on either of these points, but promised to take the whole matter into consideration, and willing to please Henry, appointed Cranmer pope's penitentiary throughout England, Wales, and Ireland. From Rome, Cranmer proceeded to Germany, where he spent nearly two years in endeavouring to convince the Lutheran divines of the nullity of the king's marriage. He succeeded in gaining over the famous Osiander to his sentiments with several members also of the emperor's court and council. Cranmer's intercourse at this time with the German protestant divines, particularly Osiander and Bucer, tended to confirm those views of religion which we have seen he had begun to cherish while at Cambridge, and, though yet holding the status of a catholic clergyman, he was privately married to a niece of his friend Osiander.

He was yet in Germany when he received notice of his appointment to the metropolitan see of England, then vacant by the death of archbishop Warham. He at first seriously hesitated to accept of this high promotion. The marriage had placed him in an awkward dilemma, for

Henry to the day of his death was a stern enforcer of the celibacy of the clergy. It was also a difficult matter for him, holding the sentiments which he did, to swear canonical obedience to the pontiff. Under these circumstances he adopted a line of conduct which Bishop Burnett has characterised as "agreeing better with the maxims of canonists and casuists, than with Cranmer's sincerity and integrity;" he contented himself with a vague and private protestation to the effect that he did not intend, by his oath to the pope, "to restrain himself from any thing to which he was bound by his duty to God or the king, or from taking any part in any reformation of the English church which he might judge to be required."

The first act of the new archbishop was one in direct opposition to papal authority, namely, the pronouncing sentence of divorce between Henry and Catharine. It is impossible to acquit Cranmer of blame in this transaction, for although he was only one of several joined in the same commission on this occasion, yet there can be no doubt that his influence was original and decisive of the question. His misconduct, however, would have been greatly aggravated in this matter if it were true, as has been asserted, that he had previously assisted at Henry's private marriage with Anne, but this has never been proved, and was always stoutly denied by the archbishop. Within three short years, he was commanded by his inexorable master to declare that this last marriage "was, and always had been, null and void." A letter which he addressed to Henry on the arrest of Anne, has been appealed to by both his friends and enemies in support of their respective views of his character, a fact which of itself stamps it with the features of equivocation and mental timidity. With equal weakness—to characterise it by no harsher name—did the archbishop soon after dissolve the marriage of Henry to Anne of Cleves.

Cromwell's plan for the abolition of the monasteries and priories was warmly supported by the archbishop. But he failed in his attempt to turn a portion of the revenues which the crown derived from this new source into such channels as would have materially tended to the promotion of learning and scriptural knowledge throughout the kingdom. His design was to erect a number of cathedrals, in each of which there should be provision made for readers of divinity, Greek, and Hebrew, and for "a great number of the students to be both exercised in the daily worship of God, and trained up in study and devotion, whom the bishop might transplant out of this nursery into all parts of his diocese." He succeeded, however, in a still more important object,—the placing of the Bible in the hands of the laity of England.

The fall of Cromwell was for many reasons peculiarly distressing to the archbishop, yet he made but a feeble effort to save his life, and voted for his attainder. The famous act of the six articles was still more trying to his feelings and conscience, and he took a more decided and resolute part against it than was customary with him in political matters. The bishops took opposite sides of the question. Cranmer urged his reasons against it for three days successively, and was followed by the bishops of Ely, Sarum, Worcester, Rochester, and St Davids. York, Durham, Winchester, and Carlisle, went as vigorously the other way. The catholics maintained that Cranmer's opposition was occasioned solely by the circumstance of his being a married man; but less

partial men, on the same side, gave him full credit for the sincerity of his opinions, and for the powers of reasoning which he exhibited in their defence. Cranmer had never publicly avowed his marriage; his wife, however, lived with him in private, and had born him several children. It cost him no small effort to abandon their society, and many and urgent were the remonstrances which he addressed even to the royal ear upon this point. But Henry remained rooted in his purpose of enforcing clerical celibacy, and Cranmer was obliged to despatch his wife and children to Germany. A strong party was now formed against the archbishop, headed by Gardiner and the duke of Norfolk; some of his enemies even ventured to affront him in public; but Henry continued to entertain a sincere esteem for him, and when on death-bed would have no ecclesiastic admitted to his presence but him.

After the death of Henry, Cranmer and the two Seymours, men thoroughly imbued with the spirit of protestantism, became the chief councillors and confidants of the young king, and exerted their united influence with much success in promoting the cause of the Reformation. Cranmer's first step was to petition the new king for a license to continue in the exercise of his archiepiscopal functions, thereby setting an example to the other prelates, which was speedily imitated, of obedience to and dependence on the will of the civil power. He next established a royal visitation for the purpose of enforcing the regular reading of the book of Homilies, and of the New Testament, in Erasmus' translation, in every church after mass. He then proceeded to lop off gradually the most unmeaning of those ceremonies which were retained in the church, such as driving out the devil by holy water and consecrated candles, bearing candles on Candlemas day, and carrying palms on Palm Sunday. The use of images was not prohibited, but their worship was strictly forbidden; and the sacrament of the Supper was ordered to be administered in both kinds. He also laid the groundwork for doctrinal reformation by inviting foreign divines and professors into England, and gave them all encouragement to disseminate the doctrines of the reformed faith. Among those who accepted of this invitation were John Knox, who was appointed one of the royal chaplains, Bucer, who was appointed to lecture on divinity at Cambridge, and Peter Martyn, who was placed in the theological chair of the sister university. The publication of a catechism "for the singular profit and instruction of children and young people," was his next measure. A more important work was the book of Common Prayer, compiled chiefly from the Romish ritual, and very similar to that in use at the present hour. Amid these changes, some of the prelates adhered to the ancient form of worship with much firmness, and it is deeply to be regretted that the imprisonment and deprivation of Bonner and Gardiner, furnished them with an excuse for that severe retaliation which their return to power enabled them to make. In fact, it is not possible to acquit even Cranmer of the charge of intolerance. If compulsion might have been pled as an excuse for the part he acted in some of Henry's acts of persecution—as for example in the affair of Lambert—that plea at least could no longer be urged in palliation of his conduct under Henry's youthful and mild-hearted successor. Yet we find him employed to overcome Edward's reluctance to sign the death-warrant

of Joan of Kent; and within a few days thereafter consigning Von Parris, a Dutchman, to the flames for Arianism.

The archbishop's admirers have also found it a difficult task to apologise for the support which he gave to Dudley in his ill-judged attempt to change the succession at the death of Edward. "I never liked it," he indeed says in his letter to Mary, "nor any thing grieved me as much as your grace's brother did, and if by any means it had been to have hindered the making of that will, I should have done it." But it is impossible to accept of his excuse that he only yielded ultimately to Edward's personal entreaties. The head of the English prelacy should have had sufficient firmness and a sufficient sense of what was his duty to his king and his country, to have resisted the entreaties of a boy-king that he would commit an action in itself unjust, illegal, and impolitic.

King Edward was buried on the 8th of August, 1553, on which occasion Cranmer officiated according to the protestant ritual. He was next day ordered to confine himself to his palace of Lambeth. Here he was joined by his friend Peter Martyn, who had fled from Oxford. Intelligence having been brought him that mass had been performed in Canterbury cathedral, and with his alleged consent and approbation, the zeal of his honest and uncompromising friend, Martyn, incited him to make a public denial of the imputation. This, at least, was a decided and bold step, and accelerated, if it did not occasion, the archbishop's committal to the Tower. It was soon after resolved to proceed to extremities with Cranmer, and the other leaders of the Reformation. "The Tower being full of prisoners," says Middleton, "Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Ridley, Latimer, and Bradford, were all put into one chamber; for which they blessed God, and for the opportunity of conversing together, reading, and comparing the Scriptures, confirming themselves in the true faith, and mutually exhorting each other to constancy in professing it, and patience in suffering for it. In April, 1544, the archbishop, with Bishop Ridley, and Bishop Latimer, was removed from the Tower to Windsor, and from thence to Oxford, to dispute with some select persons of both universities. At the first appearance of the archbishop in the public schools, three articles were given him to subscribe, in which the corporal presence, by transubstantiation, was asserted, and the mass affirmed to be a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and dead. These, he declared freely, he considered gross untruths, and promised to give an answer concerning them in writing. Accordingly, he drew it up, and when he was brought again to the schools to dispute, he delivered the writing to Dr Weston the prolocutor. At eight in the morning the disputation began, and held till two in the afternoon; all which time the archbishop constantly maintained the truth with great learning and courage, against a multitude of clamorous and insolent opponents. And three days after, he was again brought forth to oppose Dr Harpsfield, who was to respond for his degree in divinity; and here he acquitted himself so well, clearly showing the gross absurdities and inextricable difficulties of the doctrine of transubstantiation, that Weston himself could not but dismiss him with commendation." Cranmer, with all his superior light, had remained a firm and sincere believer in transubstantiation, till so

late as the year 1547. Ridley caught the important truth first, and was the means of carrying conviction to the mind of the archbishop.

On the 20th of April, Cranmer was brought before the queen's commissioners, and asked whether he would subscribe to the ancient worship. He met the proposition with a decided refusal, and was instantly condemned as an obstinate heretic. We shall state the subsequent proceedings in the words of Middleton:—"In 1556, a new commission was given to Bishop Bonner and Bishop Thirlby, for the degradation of the archbishop. When they went to Oxford, the archbishop was brought before them, and after they had read their commission from the pope, Bonner, in a scurrilous oration, insulted over him after a most unchristian manner; for which he was after rebuked by Bishop Thirlby, who had been Cranmer's particular friend, and shed many tears upon the occasion. When Bonner had finished his invective against him, they proceeded to degrade him; and that they might make him as ridiculous as they could, the episcopal habit which they put on him was made of canvass and old clouts. Then the archbishop, pulling out of his sleeve a written appeal, delivered it to them, saying, that he was not sorry to be cut off, even with all this pageantry, from any relation to the church of Rome,—that the pope had no authority over him, and that he appealed to the next general council. When they had degraded him, they put on him an old threadbare beadle's gown, and a townsman's cap, and in that garb delivered him over to the secular power."

Thus far Cranmer had nobly sustained the fiery trial of persecution, but his fortitude at last gave way, and in a fit of despondency he expressed a wish to have a conference with the legate. Again the firmness of the martyr returned, and, besides expressing regret for the weakness which he had exhibited, he wrote a long letter to the queen in defence of the Protestant doctrines. Gardiner, who knew the man he had to deal with, informed him that he must prepare for speedy execution, but, at the same time, hinted that it was not yet too late to excite the queen's clemency by a distinct and formal recantation of his most obnoxious heresies. The temptation succeeded, and six separate instruments of the most abject recantation were severally signed by him, in the vain hope of obtaining mercy. Burnet says, for six weeks he openly condemned the "errors of Luther and Zuinglius, acknowledged the pope's supremacy, the seven sacraments, the corporal presence in the eucharist, purgatory, prayer for departed souls, the invocation of saints, to which was added his being sorry for his former errors; and concluded, exhorting all that had been deceived by his example or doctrines to return to the unity of the church; and protesting that he had signed his recantation willingly, only for the discharge of his conscience." But his doom was sealed. The queen was fully resolved that, catholic or protestant, he should burn; and the 21st of March was the day fixed for his execution. To the last moment he clung to the hope of pardon; nor was it until he was actually led forth to execution, that hope finally forsook him. A Dr Cole was appointed to preach a sermon in the church of St Mary on the occasion, and the archbishop was placed opposite to him on a low platform. When Cole had finished his harangue, the purport of which was to proclaim the return of the arch-heretic to the bosom of the mother-church, but also to show

that it was expedient Cranmer should suffer, notwithstanding his recantation, the archbishop was called upon to declare his faith; whereupon, to the astonishment of all, he solemnly retracted all his recantations, and ended by denouncing the pope as Christ's enemy and anti-christ. "Upon which," says Middleton, "they pulled him off the stage with the utmost fury, and hurried him to the place of his martyrdom, over against Baliol college: where he put off his clothes with haste, and, standing in his shirt and without his shoes, was fastened with a chain to the stake. Some pressing him to agree to his former recantation, he answered, showing his hand, 'This is the hand that wrote, and therefore it shall first suffer punishment.' Fire being applied to him, he stretched out his right hand into the flame, and held it there unmoved, except that once he wiped his face with it, till it was consumed, crying with a loud voice, 'This hand hath offended!' and often repeating, 'This unworthy right hand!' At last, the fire getting up, he soon expired, never stirring or crying out all the while, only keeping his eyes fixed to heaven, and repeating more than once, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!' he died in the sixty-seventh year of his age."

The character of Cranmer has been the subject of keen controversy. Mr Hallam says, "if we weigh the character of this prelate in an equal balance, he will appear far, indeed, removed from the turpitude imputed to him by his enemies, yet not entitled to any extraordinary veneration." Others have not hesitated to enrol him in the very highest rank of English patriots and Christian martyrs. The truth, as usual in such cases, may perhaps lie between these extremes. Cranmer was a conscientious, but feeble, character; he saw and loved the truth, but wanted firmness to pursue it amidst the difficulties which the complexion of the times threw in his way. His cruel death has alone preserved his memory from reproach. Had Mary spared his life, he would never, it is most probable, have retracted the steps by which he forsook the profession of the reformed faith, until the re-ascendency of protestant principles, under her successor, had rendered it impossible for any one, situated as he was, to resume his profession of attachment to the reformed doctrines, without incurring universal suspicion and the contempt of posterity. His life has been written with much elegance by Gilpin, and voluminously by the Rev. J. H. Todd.

Bishop Gardiner.

BORN A. D. 1483.—DIED A. D. 1555.

STEPHEN GARDINER was the natural son of Lionel Woodville, bishop of Salisbury, brother to the Lady Elizabeth Woodville, who, while the widow of Sir John Grey, captivated the affections of Edward IV. and became his queen. Gardiner was born in 1483, at St Edmund's Bury, Suffolk. He received his education at Trinity hall, Cambridge, where he distinguished himself by his progress in the study of the canon and civil law, the classics, and theology. In 1520, he succeeded to the headship of the society to which he belonged, but soon after left the university and attached himself to the Howard family. When a favourable opportunity offered of ingratiating himself

with Wolsey, who was fast rising into power, he left the Howards, and obtained the patronage of the favourite. In the service of this prelate he obtained his high opinion and confidence, by his activity as an agent, and his ability as a secretary. The patronage of his master introduced him to the favour of the court. In 1527, his talents and address had made such an impression on Wolsey and those in power, that he was intrusted with the negotiation then going on at the papal court, respecting the king's divorce from Catharine of Arragon. Although he was unsuccessful in his mission, his exertions were not the less appreciated, and he was rewarded with the archdeaconries of Norwich and Leicester in succession, and the appointment of secretary of state. His devotion to the king now got the better of his allegiance, as churchman, to the pope, and he not only did every thing in his power to facilitate Henry's designs with respect to the queen, but, on the king's abjuring the supremacy of the pope, and declaring himself supreme head of the church, he warmly supported him, and was created bishop of Winchester. The first proof of his acquiescence in, and approbation of, this measure was a treatise written by him in its defence, entitled, 'De vera obedientia.' The bishop continued to enjoy the full sunshine of court favour, till the capricious sovereign, taking a disgust at Queen Catherine Parr, consulted with him on the easiest method of getting rid of her, and acquiesced in a plan, the leading feature of which was the exhibition of articles against her on a charge of heresy. The charge had proceeded so far that officers were already summoned for the purpose of arresting her, when the queen, in a personal interview with her husband, had sufficient address to turn the tables on the bishop, to re-establish herself in the king's favour, and to plunge the bishop, whom she suspected of being her principal adversary, into a state of disgrace from which he never extricated himself during the reign of Henry. On the accession of Edward VI. Bishop Gardiner was placed in more unfavourable circumstances still. He had been so strenuous an opposer of the doctrines of the reformed church, and of their establishment as the national religion, that the prevailing party viewed him with great suspicion, and visited him with marks of their high displeasure. He was, at their instigation, committed to the Tower by the young king, and deprived of his diocese. Mary's accession again changed the scene, and brought Gardiner once more forth into liberty and power. He was received into royal favour, restored to his see, and even elevated to the office of chancellor of England, and first minister of state. He had learned but little in the school of adversity, and the persecution he had undergone, on account of his religious tenets, had not taught him to respect the conscience of another. On the other hand, his own sufferings appear to have hardened his heart, and produced a bitter spirit of bigotry and cruelty. He soon distinguished himself as the principal instrument in the hands of the infatuated queen; and, during this reign, took the lead in all the murderous executions which stigmatized it, often acting with such a compound of caprice and cruelty as excites the utmost abhorrence and contempt. The history of the martyrs presents Gardiner in a most disgusting point of view, as discovering fiend-like craft and cruelty. In his private character, he appears to better advantage, as he was learned himself, and a great encourager of learn-

ing in others. The brightest trait in his character was gratitude, which he possessed in an unusual degree; this he manifested towards Wolsey, to whom he was as much devoted in his decline as in the zenith of his prosperity; and, notwithstanding the coolness and injustice he experienced from King Henry, towards the close of that prince's reign, he never was known to speak of him, but in terms of affectionate respect. He was often heard to exclaim, in the latter part of his life, 'Erravi cum Petro sed non flevi cum Petro!' He died November 12th, 1555. A treatise by him, entitled, 'Necessary Doctrine of a Christian Man,' printed in 1543, is said to be a joint work by him and Cranmer.

Bishop Tunstall.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1474.—DIED A. D. 1559.

THIS prelate, who acts a distinguished part in the annals of the English hierarchy, is generally supposed to have been the illegitimate son of Sir Richard Tunstall of Thurland castle in Lancashire. Surtees, in his 'History of Durham,' seems inclined to think that he was the son of Thomas Tunstall, the brother and heir of Sir Richard, and consequently the brother of Sir Brian Tunstall who fell at Floddon. Rumour affixes a stigma to his birth; he is said to have been the offspring of an illegitimate amour with a lady of the Conyers family.¹ He was admitted a student of Baliol college in 1491, but soon afterwards proceeded to Padua where he took the degree of doctor of laws. Godwin represents him as having attained high reputation as a scholar whilst studying abroad. On his return to his native country in 1508, he was presented to the rectory of Stanhope in the county of Durham; and in 1514, Archbishop Warham constituted him vicar-general or chancellor of the see of Canterbury, and recommended him to the notice of his sovereign, Henry VIII. Preferments now flowed rapidly upon him; and in 1516, he was appointed master of the rolls,—an office then chiefly supplied by churchmen, and for which he was eminently qualified by his early legal studies. In the same year he was joined with Sir Thomas More in an embassy to Charles V. then at Brussels. He there lodged under the same roof with the celebrated Erasmus, whose friendship he afterwards enjoyed throughout life. That most distinguished scholar has borne decided testimony to Tunstall's learning and varied acquirements, describing him as a man who excelled all his contemporaries in a critical acquaintance with the learned languages, and who to extensive scholarship united the more solid qualifications of an acute perception and sound judgment. It would appear that he acquitted himself in his embassy to the satisfaction of his royal master, as immediately on his return to London, he was again despatched with a similar commission to the diet of the empire at Worms. These services were rewarded with a succession of clerical appointments. In 1522, he was promoted to the bishopric of London; and in 1523, made keeper of the privy seal.

¹ This has been called in question with considerable success. See Hutchinson's Durham, vol. i. p. 412.

In 1525, Bishop Tunstall accompanied Sir Richard Wingfield into Spain to solicit the release of Francis, afterwards king of France, who had been taken prisoner in the battle of Pavia; and in 1527, we find him attending Cardinal Wolsey in his pompous embassy to France. The richer see of Durham rewarded these fresh services in 1529. The associate of Wolsey could hardly be expected to look with a favourable eye upon the early efforts of the reformers; accordingly we find him adopting measures for the suppression of Tyndale's edition of the New Testament, and for preventing the dissemination of the new doctrines; yet it is but fair to add, that in all these measures Tunstall exhibited a spirit very different from that which actuated many of his contemporaries. He was willing to burn Tyndale's books, but he was always an advocate for the milder methods of reclaiming heretics themselves; and it is recorded to the praise of his humanity, that during the heat of the Marian persecution not a single victim suffered in the diocese of Durham.

Tunstall's character lies exposed to the charge of weakness and irresolution. When Henry VIII., in defiance of the pope's authority, assumed the title of supreme head of the English church, Tunstall at first remonstrated, then hesitated, and finally publicly defended the king's right to the supremacy from the pulpit. In 1537, Tunstall was appointed by the king to confer with the divines sent from the protestant princes of Germany to press a further reformation; and in 1541, he appears in conjunction with Heath, bishop of Rochester, as the editor of a revised version of the Scriptures. The confidence which his royal master reposed in him did not, however, save the see of Durham from the operations of Henry's sweeping measures of ecclesiastical reform. By the act 27^o Henry VIII., the ancient honours and peculiar privileges which former monarchs, during a period of six centuries, had successively conferred on that see, were swept away at a blow; but the bishop wisely bowed to the storm, and continued in favour at court.

On the accession of Edward VI. Tunstall opposed, but with becoming moderation, the measures of the protestant party, and was allowed to remain in the undisturbed enjoyment of his see. But in 1551 he was suddenly committed to the Tower on a charge of misprision of treason. Burnet attributes this measure to the cupidity of the profligate Dudley, duke of Northumberland, who wished to obtain the temporalities of the bishop's rich see and be made count-palatine of Durham. The attainder passed against him in the house of lords, although Cranmer spoke warmly and freely in his defence; but the commons, dissatisfied with the evidence adduced, threw out the bill. The duke had then recourse to a commission directed to the chief justice of the king's bench, and six others. This scheme succeeded better than the plan of attainder. The commissioners, who were all creatures of the duke, pronounced the bishop guilty of misprision of treason, and passed sentence of deprivation against him on the 14th of August, 1552. Tunstall was immediately committed to the Tower; and in the month of May following, Northumberland obtained letters patent appointing him steward of the revenues of Durham.

The accession of Mary changed the complexion of the bishop's fortunes, and restored him to his bishopric. But, though joined with

Bonner and Gardiner in the commission for the deprivation of the married bishops, he was of much too mild a temper to go heartily along with these bloody-minded bigots in their work of intolerance. In fact he appears to have confined himself within his diocese during the whole of that bloody reign; and to have put forth his powers chiefly for the purpose of screening the victims of persecution. Fox tells us, that when one Russell, a preacher, was brought before Tunstall on a charge of heresy, and his chancellor would have examined him more particularly, the bishop prevented him, remarking: "hitherto we have had a good report among our neighbours; I pray you, bring not this man's blood upon my head." It is also a proof of Tunstall's easy disposition at least, that when his nephew, the celebrated Bernard Gilpin, an avowed protestant, came home from his travels on the continent, he not only received the young man with great tenderness, but even bestowed on him the archdeaconry of Durham. One might feel disposed to attribute such leniency to an entire indifference to religion on the part of Tunstall; but Gilpin, whose testimony will not be called in question, believed his uncle to be a conscientious man, and has recorded some pleasing instances of the dominion which religious feelings possessed over his whole character.² It is also matter of history that Elizabeth on her accession, had nominated him first in a list of prelates to officiate at the consecration of several new bishops; but he refused to take the oath of supremacy to a protestant princess, and quietly submitted to the sentence of deprivation which followed. The remainder of his days were spent under the roof of Archbishop Parker. He died on the 18th of November, 1559, aged 85, and was buried in the chancel of Lambeth church.

John Bale.

BORN A. D. 1495.—DIED A. D. 1563.

JOHN BALE was born at Cove, near Dunwich, in Suffolk, November 21, 1495. He received his early instructions at the monastery of the Carmelites, in Norwich, and from thence was sent to Jesus college, Cambridge. He was educated in the bosom of the Romish church, and initiated into all its superstitions, and we are informed was a zealous papist before the light of protestantism broke in upon his mind. The exact period at which he received that light by which he was led to detect the errors of popery, and to relinquish the communion of that church, does not clearly appear, but he attributes to "the illustrious, the Lord Wentworth, that he was stirred up to discover the glory of the Son of God, and his own deformity." Soon after his renunciation of the tenets of the Romish church, he married a pious lady, who was a great assistance to him in his religious career. He manifested great decision of character, and became a zealous preacher of that gospel which he had felt to be the power of God to his own salvation. No sooner did he discover the errors of popery and the vices of the clergy, than he exposed them with great freedom and boldness. The

² See Gilpin's Life of Gilpin.

resentment of the priesthood was roused to a high degree, because on one occasion, at Doncaster, he openly declared against the invocation of saints. For this offence he was dragged from the pulpit to the consistory of York, to appear before Archbishop Lee, when he was cast into prison. Stokesly, bishop of London, subsequently treated him with equal severity, and doubtless would have proceeded to extremities but for the seasonable and powerful interference of Lord Cromwell, who was at that time a favourite with King Henry VIII. After the decease of this eminent nobleman, he withdrew from the storm of persecution which threatened the land, and retired into Germany. There he found, in the society of Martin Luther, and his distinguished coadjutors, a hospitable and safe retreat for about eight years, and pursued his studies with avidity, and employed his pen in writing against the superstitions of popery, and defending the principles of the reformation.

After the death of King Henry, when the pious Edward VI. had ascended the British throne, Bale was invited home, and presented to the benefice of Bishopstoke, in Hampshire. Here he lived in retirement, and was deeply engaged in various publications which the peculiar state of the times called for. So entirely was he secluded from the busy world, that when he waited on his majesty at Southampton, the king was greatly surprised and delighted to see him, having heard that he was dead. He then appointed him to the see of Ossory, in Ireland, which was then vacant. Bale, at first, declined the proffered elevation, and pleaded his age, ill health, and poverty; but the king not admitting his excuses, he at length consented, and was installed without any expense to himself, according to the new form, as he positively refused being consecrated according to the old popish fashion. The influence and facilities for study which his new situation afforded him were sedulously employed in furthering the object which was dearest to his heart. He preached the gospel, used every means in his power to bring the people to renounce popery, and to embrace Christ Jesus, and employed his purse to enrich his library with such books and manuscripts as would enable him to employ his pen with the greater effect for the cause of God, of truth, and of the Reformation. Upon the accession of Queen Mary, popery returned with all its horrors to scourge the land. Bale was again exposed to the bitter resentment of his enemies. He had laboured with assiduity to reform his diocese, and to correct the abominable vices of the priests, to abolish the mass, and to establish the new Book of Common Prayer, but his zealous and well-meant efforts exasperated his enemies, who were excited by their rage and malice to seek his life. Five of his domestics were murdered near his house, and but for the seasonable arrival of the governor of Kilkenny with a troop of soldiers, he must have shared the same fate. Having heard that the Romish priests had seized his books and moveables, and were then conspired to take away his life, his only alternative was to seek security in flight. He first went to Dublin, where he concealed himself till an opportunity offered which appeared favourable for his escape to Scotland. He took his passage in a trading vessel bound for that country, but was taken prisoner by the captain of a Dutch man-of-war, who robbed him of all his property. This ship was driven by distress of weather into St Ives, in Cornwall, where

Bale was taken up on suspicion of treason. The accusation was brought against him by one Walter, an Irishman, the pilot of the Dutch ship. The captain and purser, however, fearing lest they should be deprived of the property they had taken from him, deposed in his favour, and he was honourably acquitted. The fugitive was soon brought into circumstances of still more imminent peril. In a few days the ship arrived in Dover roads, where one Martin persuaded the captain and his crew that Bale had been the principal instrument of pulling down the mass in England, and in keeping Dr Gardiner so long in the Tower, and that he had poisoned the king. With this information, the captain and purser went ashore, carrying along with them his episcopal seal and several letters from Melancthon and other celebrated reformers, with the council's letter of his appointment to the bishopric of Ossory. It was proposed to send Bale to London, or to send two persons to the privy council with information, but, upon his strong remonstrances to the captain, and offering to pay fifty pounds for his ransom, on his arrival in Holland, he was carried into Zealand, and lodged in the house of one of the owners of the ship, by whom he was treated with great kindness. He had only six days allowed him to raise the money agreed on for his ransom, and was not permitted to go abroad to find his friends. While in this state of perplexity and distress, he was sometimes threatened to be thrown into the common gaol, sometimes to be brought before the magistrates, or the clergy, at other times, to be sent to London, or to be delivered to the queen's ambassador at Brussels. At length his kind host interposed, and obtained his discharge on paying thirty pounds for his ransom.

Dr Bale, having obtained his liberty, retired to Frankfort, where the English exiles were favoured by the magistrates with the use of one of the churches. The exiles having found a quiet home in a foreign land, first settled their new congregation and then entered into a correspondence with their brethren who had found refuge in other places. Their harmony was interrupted by the arrival of Dr Cox, when Dr Bale retired to Basil, in Switzerland, where he remained until the death of Queen Mary. On the accession of Queen Elizabeth, he returned to England, but not to his bishopric in Ireland. The queen had, during her minority, and while exercised with troubles under her sister Mary, showed him the highest respect, but it was very manifest afterwards, that she had withdrawn her affections from him. Probably he had imbibed too deeply the principles of the reformed churches to be acceptable to so bigotted an episcopalian as Elizabeth. The Doctor contented himself with a prebend in the church of Canterbury, the rest of his days, and refused to accept of his bishopric. Many of the pious reformers, while living among foreign protestants, examined more minutely the grand principles of the Reformation; on those principles they acted while in a foreign land; nor could they forget them on their return to their native country. They laboured to obtain a more perfect reformation of the English church. Dr Bale was among their number, and this accounts for his having refused preferment, as he was a zealous opposer of the Romish superstitions, and was against the English rites and ceremonies. It was a settled principle with him, that the government of the church by bishops did not commence till the beginning of the seventeenth century, and consequently he was

opposed to the divine institution of bishops. When summoned to assist in the consecration of Archbishop Parker, he refused to attend, doubtless because he entertained these principles. He died at Canterbury, November, 1563, aged sixty-eight years, and his remains were interred in the cathedral at that place. The character of Dr Bale has been drawn by his friends and his enemies; the representation of the latter being in perfect contrast with that of the former. His writings against the papacy were both voluminous and pungent, and they stung his enemies to madness: but, in reading the testimony of such men in such times, it becomes us to bear in mind that they were wont to call evil good and good evil, and therefore the censure of his enemies may be reckoned as his highest commendation.

Dr Bale wrote much, but his most celebrated work consisted of the 'Lives of the most Eminent Writers.' It came out at three different times. His "*Summarium illustrium majoris Brytanniæ Scriptorum*" was published at Wesel, 1549. This was addressed to King Edward, and contained only 'five centuries' of writers. Afterwards, he added four more, and made several corrections and additions. The book, thus enlarged, was entitled, "*Scriptorum illustrium majoris Brytanniæ, quam nunc Angliam et Scotiam vocant, Catalogus; a Japheto per 3618 annos, usque ad annum hunc Domini 1557, &c.*" It was completed and printed at Basil, while the author was in a state of exile. The writers whose lives are contained in this celebrated work, are those of Great Britain, including England and Scotland. The work commences from Japhet, one of the sons of Noah, and is carried down through a series of 3618 years, to the year of our Lord 1557.

Miles Coverdale.

BORN A. D. 1487.—DIED A. D. 1567.

MILES COVERDALE, one of the most important names which occur in the history of biblical literature, was bishop of Exeter in the reign of Edward the Sixth. He was born in Yorkshire, 1487. For this we have the authority of his epitaph. He received his education at Cambridge, in a house of Augustine friars, of which Dr Barnes, afterwards one of the protestant martyrs, was then prior. Godwin tells us that he received the degree of D.D. from the university of Tubingen, but has neglected to mention the date of this transaction. It was not till many years after this, that Cambridge conferred upon him the same honour. Early impressions in favour of the religion in which he had been educated, induced him to become an Augustine monk. In 1514 he entered into holy orders, and was ordained at Norwich; but he afterwards renounced popery, and Bale tells us that he and Dr Barnes, his former superior, were amongst the very first who preached the doctrines of the Reformation. It was about 1530 that the reformed religion began to make progress at Cambridge. Men of learning, both from colleges and monasteries, met together for friendly conference on those points which had been discussed by the reformers in various parts of Europe. Their usual place of assembling was called the 'White House,' and being close to King's, Queen's, and St John's colleges, was

easily accessible. Here Miles Coverdale imbibed the principles of the Reformation, and was certainly one of the earliest converts to them. Soon after this, he appears to have been abroad assisting Tyndale in his translation of the Bible; and in 1535 he published his own, dedicating it to King Henry VIII. It was printed in one volume folio. From the appearance of the types, it has been conjectured that it was printed by Christopher Froschower, at Zurich. As his revision of the press was most careful and accurate, he must have resided in the place—wherever it was—at which his Bible was printed. This translation was called *special*, because it differed from the former translations; as may be seen by a comparison of it with Tyndale's. The Psalms are those now used in the Book of Common Prayer. Coverdale, then, is entitled to the honour of having been the first who had translated the *whole* Bible into English, and of bringing it out under the express sanction of royal authority.

No sooner had Coverdale finished this great work, than he commenced another. In 1538, a quarto Latin (Vulgate) Testament appeared, with Coverdale's English, and a dedication by him. In this dedication is found the following passage:—"He does not doubt but such ignorant bodies as, having cure of souls, are very unlearned in the Latin tongue, shall, through this small labour, be occasioned to attain unto true knowledge, or at least be constrained to say well of the thing which they have heretofore blasphemed."

At the close of 1538, Coverdale again visited the continent to superintend a new edition of the Bible. It appears that, on account of the superior skill of the workmen at Paris, as well as the greater cheapness and better quality of the paper, King Henry requested Francis I. to allow Grafton, the celebrated printer, to send forth an edition of the English Bible. To this the French monarch acceded; and the indefatigable Coverdale was despatched to superintend the press. But just as the work was completed, the Inquisition interfered, and demanded that the press should be stopped and the whole impression burnt. They dated their order, Dec. 17, 1538. It was forthwith executed, and 2,500 copies instantly committed to the flames. This shows at once the jealousy with which the Romanists regarded the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular tongues, as well as the irresistible power which they wielded. The will of monarchs was obliged to yield to theirs. That Providence, however, which can turn even the vices of men to account, not only defeated the machinations of the inquisitors, but rendered them subservient to the most important and beneficial results. It appears that one of the officers of the Inquisition, whose avarice got the better of his bigotry, rescued a few chests of the heretical volumes from the flames, and sold them to a haberdasher as waste paper. The English proprietors ventured to return to Paris, after the alarm had somewhat subsided, and succeeded not only in obtaining some of the copies of the condemned impression, but—what was far more important—in bringing the presses, types, and printers, to England. Here they instantly set to work, and 'Cranmer's,' or the 'Great Bible,' as it was called, issued, in 1539, from the work-shop of Grafton and Whitchurch. In this edition, Coverdale carefully compared the translation with the original; but notwithstanding all his care, various suspicions were insinuated, not only of its inaccuracy, but even of the

heterodoxy of some portions. Against this gross charge, Coverdale took an opportunity of vindicating himself, when he preached at Paul's cross,—a task of which he acquitted himself with equal candour and courage. He said, "that he himself now saw some faults, which, if he might review the book once again, as he had twice before, he had no doubt he should amend; but for any *heresy*, he was sure that there was none maintained in his translation."

In these arduous and most important labours, equally honourable to himself and beneficial to his country, Coverdale was not permitted to work—as too many have been—uncheered by the smiles of patronage. Thomas Lord Cromwell was a liberal patron of his. He was also almoner to Catharine Parr—the last of King Henry's queens—who was a decided friend of the Reformation. In virtue of this office, he officiated at her funeral, at Sudely castle in Gloucestershire, the residence of her last husband, Thomas Lord Seymour; on which occasion, by the bye, our reformer took an opportunity not only of giving utterance to the great doctrines of the Reformation, but of explaining away, in quite a protestant style, the popish trumpery with which, as usual, the funeral was celebrated. "The offeringe," he said, "which was there don, was not don any thinge to profytt the deade, but for the poor onelye; and also the lights which were caried, &c. were for the honour of the person, and for no other entente nor purpose," &c. In 1547, he preached at St Paul's against some Anabaptists, whom, with greater effect than is found generally to accompany the efforts of the controversialist, he is said to have reclaimed. In 1551 he was raised to the see of Exeter, and his elevation was accompanied with the most flattering testimonials of the esteem in which King Edward held him. It was expressly stated, that "he was promoted on account of his extraordinary knowledge in divinity, and his unblemished character." The circumstances which, it is conjectured, were partly the cause of his elevation, are very curious, and deserve to be recorded. It appears that Lord Russel was sent, in 1549, to suppress the rebellion in the west, and Coverdale was appointed to accompany him. It is said that the reformer's preaching was the most effectual means of quieting the minds of the people. This probably suggested the propriety of choosing such a man for such a quarter; and upon the death of the then bishop—a bigoted catholic, and in every respect the opposite of Coverdale—he was chosen his successor. At his first appointment, his poverty would not permit him to pay the first-fruits; from which, therefore, the king, at the request of Cranmer, exempted him.

In his diocese, he, of course, favoured the spread of the reformed religion. In the administration of all its affairs, however, he displayed the strictest equity. So anxious was he that the law, both civil and ecclesiastical—in which he did not pretend to be very profoundly skilled—should be justly executed, that he requested the university of Oxford to recommend a suitable chancellor for his diocese. They recommended Dr Robert Weston, afterwards the Irish lord-chancellor, whom Coverdale treated with the greatest liberality.

All his noble qualities, however,—his integrity, his humility, his generosity, his hospitality, his unwearied efforts to do good, his diligent discharge of his functions,—could not protect him from the slanders of the enemies of the Reformation. So long as Edward VI. lived, they

little troubled him,—he could defy their calumnies. But no sooner did Mary accede to the throne, than he was ejected from his bishopric and cast into prison. After two years' confinement, he was released at the solicitation of the king of Denmark. This auspicious interposition was brought about in a very remarkable manner. It appears that Dr Machabæus, the chaplain of the king of Denmark, and Coverdale, had married sisters. On Coverdale's imprisonment, Dr M. informed his royal master of the perilous circumstances in which his relative was placed. It was not, however, until the king had written two or three times, that Mary yielded to his solicitation. Coverdale has sometimes been charged with having taken a part in an insurrection against the queen; and this has been sometimes represented as the cause of his imprisonment. As the queen, however, did not urge this in her reply to his Danish majesty, we may conclude it to be utterly false. It seems to have been more likely owing to his non-payment of the tenths; as the first-fruits had been already remitted by the royal permission. The plea which Coverdale set up when charged with this, was, that he had not enjoyed the bishopric long enough to meet their claims. No sooner was he set at liberty—which was on the hard condition of expatriating himself—than he repaired to the court of Denmark. The monarch who had procured his pardon was anxious to detain him. But the conscientious reformer not being able to preach in Danish, preferred those places where his lips would not be sealed on the most important themes, and was contented to be a wanderer, and homeless, so that he might glorify his Master. He repaired, therefore, to Wesel, then to Bergzabern, and lastly to Geneva, where he joined many of the English exiles, and assisted in the translation of the 'Geneva Bible.' This translation had notes, which brought it into very general use,—so much so, that between the years 1560 and 1616, there were not less than thirty editions printed, in folio, 4to, and 8vo.

When Elizabeth ascended the throne, Coverdale returned to his native land, but with much altered views on the subjects of church discipline and the ceremonies, in which he pleaded for the severe simplicity of the Geneva school. At the consecration of Archbishop Parker, at which Coverdale assisted, he refused to wear any thing more than a long black cloth gown. Such conduct, in such times, of course, completely blocked up the way to preferment. Many of his friends were, it is true, extremely anxious for his advancement, and none more so than Grindall. That amiable prelate was known to say on this subject—"I cannot excuse us bishops;" he even applied to the secretary of state, telling him that it was unjust "that father Coverdale, who was in Christ before us all, should now be without support." He then proceeded to recommend him to the bishopric of Llandaff, which was effected; but the increasing infirmities of our reformer caused him to decline so important a charge. The bishop then collated him to the rectory of St Magnus, near old London bridge. Here, again, he had to complain that his abject poverty—of which he makes affecting mention in some of his letters—would not permit him to pay his first-fruits, which were again remitted. He exercised his ministry here no more than two years; when he either resigned, or was compelled to abandon his charge. This was in 1566, only a little before his death. While he did preach, he was, as may readily be supposed, the favour-

ite preacher of the puritans. He died, as some say, in 1565, or as others, in 1567; the parish-register, however, proves that he was buried, Feb. 19, 1568, in the church of St Bartholomew, Exchange.

Of the numerous tracts which Coverdale put forth, most of which were in defence of the principles or doctrines of the Reformation, it is impossible to give a correct list. They are very rarely to be met with. By far the greater part of them are translations from the German. No manuscripts of Bishop Coverdale remain, except a short letter in the Harleian collection.

Bishop Bonner.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1500.—DIED A. D. 1569.

THE character of this ecclesiastic is written in letters of blood on the page of English history. "Nature seems to have designed him for an executioner," says Grainger, and the remark is not too severe. He was born of humble parentage at Hanley in Worcestershire. Finding a generous patron in his boyhood, he was sent to school, and afterwards entered of Broadgate hall, Oxford. He entered into orders about the year 1519, and shortly afterwards received an appointment from Cardinal Wolsey, who continued to patronise him until his own sudden fall from power. The cardinal's death, however, did not block up Bonner's road to preferment, for soon after we find him in high favour both with Henry VIII. and his new minister Cromwell. He began his career as a courtier by favouring the Lutherans and promoting the king's divorce from Catharine of Spain. In 1532, he was sent to Rome to apologise to the holy father for Henry's non-compliance with his solemn citation. The next year he again appeared at Rome, to deliver his master's appeal from the decision of the pope to the first general council. Bonner seems to have been selected for these services on account of his bold and fearless character; and he betrayed so much effrontery and virulence on the occasion of his second appearance at Rome, that the holy father talked of punishing his audacity by throwing him into a cauldron of melted lead, on which he very wisely withdrew himself by secret flight from the papal dominions. In 1538, while discharging the duties of ambassador at the French court, he was nominated to the bishopric of Hereford; but was translated before consecration to that of London.

At the time of Henry's death, Bonner filled the situation of ambassador at the court of Charles V. He had gone along with Henry in a variety of acts hostile to the Catholic religion, but he now changed his line of policy, and declined to renounce his allegiance to the pope, when called upon to do so by Edward's council. His obstinacy was punished by imprisonment in the Fleet prison, but having given in his submission, he was soon afterwards released from confinement. His remissness in the execution of the orders in court, particularly those relating to the use of the common prayer-book, drew upon him a severe reprimand from the privy-council. For subsequent acts of contempt, he was at last committed to the Marshalsea, and deprived of his bishopric.

On the accession of Mary, he was restored to his see, and made president of the convocation in room of Cranmer. The same year, he visited

his diocese and exerted himself with great zeal in rooting out all traces of the Reformation and in re-establishing the sacrament of the mass. Within three years thereafter, this merciless prelate had committed upwards of two hundred persons to the flames on account of their refusing to conform to the tenets and worship of the Roman church.¹ Among his more distinguished victims, was Anne Askew, John Rogers, Bishop Hooper, and John Bradford.

On the death of Mary, Bonner affected to congratulate her successor, and for this purpose went to meet Elizabeth at Highgate, but that princess shrunk from the blood-stained priest, and declined to show him any mark of favour. On being required to take the oath of allegiance and supremacy to Elizabeth, he was deprived a second time of his bishopric and committed to the Marshalsea, where he died after some years confinement, on the 5th of September, 1569.

The Roman catholic historian, Dodd, has attempted to excuse Bonner's cruelties by weakly arguing, that "seeing he proceeded according to the statutes then in force, and by the directions of the legislative power, he stands in no need of apology on that score." As if Bonner himself had had no hand in re-enacting those persecuting statutes, and as if his putting them in force was not as much an act of free choice on his part as his declining to take the oath of allegiance to Elizabeth. Besides, Bonner repeatedly gave evidence of the cruelty and malignity of his disposition, by anticipating or aggravating the sentence of the law; sometimes he would snatch the whip from the hands of the executioner, and apply it with his own hands to his unfortunate prisoners; and on one occasion he first tore out the beard of a poor man, in a transport of wrath at his inflexible adherence to the reformed faith, and then held his hand to a candle till the sinews and veins burst. Mr John Harrington tells us, that when Bonner was shown a wooden print of himself in the first edition of Fox's 'Acts and Monuments,' wherein he is represented scourging Thomas Henshawe with his own hands, the unabashed prelate only laughed aloud at the sketch, and exclaimed, "A vengeance on the fool! How could he get my picture drawn so accurately?"

Bishop Jewel.

BORN A. D. 1522.—DIED A. D. 1571.

JOHN JEWEL was born at Buden, in the parish of Barry-Narber, in the county of Devon, 24th May, 1522. His parents were highly respectable in their circumstances, and truly estimable in their dispositions and characters. The early years of our author were passed under the wise and careful superintendence of his parents, who cherished those talents in their son, the dawn of which was manifest in his youth, and assiduously watched the tender buds of genius and piety which were destined hereafter to shed so rich a fragrance. He was sent to school first in Barnstaple, where his master became exceedingly attached to him, in consequence of the loveliness of his disposition, the quickness of his parts, and the diligence of his application to study.

¹ Collier's Eccles. Hist. ii. p. 396.

Nor was the attachment of the scholar to his teacher less ardent, sincere, or permanent, but was displayed in after life by condescending regard when he became a bishop, as well as by the reward of his esteemed instructions. At the age of thirteen he was removed to Oxford, and committed to the care of Mr Burrey of Merton college, a man but meanly learned, and strenuous for popery. Soon after his removal to Oxford, he was taken notice of by Mr Parkhurst, who employed him as his amanuensis, and was desirous not only of imparting to him all wholesome learning, but to season his mind with pure religion. Mr Parkhurst received him under his own tuition, and bestowed upon him the place which he had in his gift, and often took occasion in his presence to dispute with Mr Burrey about controverted points. Intending to collate the translations of Tyndale and Coverdale, he gave Burrey Tyndale's translation to read, while he overlooked Coverdale's. During this collation Jewel often smiled, which Mr Parkhurst observing, and marvelling that one so young should mark the barbarisms in the vulgar translation, he exclaimed, "Surely Paul's cross will one day ring of this boy!" These words seemed prophetic of that noble sermon, which many years after he preached on that spot, by which he dealt so heavy a blow at the superstitions of the popish mass as all its advocates have never been able to counteract.

He removed from Merton college to Corpus Christi, where he was placed on the senior logic form, and wherein he took his degree before the senior. He excelled in his early years in poetry and eloquence, for which his talents were greatly admired. Not long after he took his degree, he was unanimously chosen in preference to many masters and bachelors, his seniors, to read the Humanity lecture, in which he acquitted himself with such diligence and acceptance, that many came from other colleges to hear him, drawn by the report of his ability, and even by the beauties of his rhetoric, and the pungency and brilliance of his wit. His habits of study were intense, and even his recreations from study were studious, being spent either in instructing his scholars, in disputing with others, or in ruminating over those subjects on which he had been reading. His conversation and deportment were highly exemplary, and in those years of life in which the passions are strongest, and the world has the most powerful influence to draw the heart and feet aside, even an enemy was obliged to testify,—“I should love thee, Jewel, if thou wert not a Zuinglian; in thy faith I hold thee a heretic, but in thy life thou art an angel!” Thus he grew in learning, religion and fame, during the reign of Henry the Eighth, towards the end of which he became master of arts. In the short reign of Edward the Sixth, his reputation and influence rose rapidly, and to the highest pitch. Jewel hearing of the fame of Peter Martyr, the new professor of divinity at Oxford, repaired to him for instruction, copied out his lectures, and was his notary in the disputation in the divinity schools, with Chedsey, Tresham, Morgan and others, about the real presence, and afterwards became intimate with him. While these days of peace and liberty continued, he read a lecture in the hall, and privately to his scholars. He preached also at Sunningwell. On the accession of Queen Mary, he was ordered to leave his college; and his farewell address on this occasion breathed a spirit of deep-toned feeling and glowing eloquence. After taking leave of the university

he was in imminent danger of falling into the hands of the execrable Bonner. In his flight from Oxford, he went on foot in a snowy winter's night towards London, and would probably have perished from the inclemency of the weather, had he not been found by Bishop Latimer's servant, who discovered him on the ground, panting and labouring for life. Soon afterwards, he followed the example of many of his pious countrymen, and escaped beyond the sea. Previously to his departure for the continent, it appears he was by the craft of some of the popish prelates entrapped to sign a book, whereby he seemed to countenance some of the popish errors. This subscription wounded his conscience, beclouded his character, and grieved his persecuted brethren, but did not mitigate the persecuting spirit of his enemies, nor promote his own safety. His biographers, while they faithfully record this blot on his reputation, deplore it, and our author himself, immediately after his arrival at Frankfort, preached an excellent sermon; at the close of which, with a flood of tears, he said, "It was my abject, and cowardly mind, and faint heart, that made my weak heart to commit this wickedness;" then with deep groans and sighs, he made humble supplication for pardon, first to Almighty God, whom he had offended, and afterwards to his church which he had scandalized. The large congregation was deeply affected, and after the sermon, embraced him as a brother. At Frankfort, he met with many eminent men, his countrymen, and being invited by several kind letters from Peter Martyr, he went to Argentine, where he met with Bishop Peynet, Archbishop Grindall, and many gentlemen who had left their native soil and all their estates, with friends and kindred, for the testimony of the gospel of Jesus Christ. When Peter Martyr was sent for by the senate of the Tigrines to succeed Rebian in the Hebrew lecture and exposition of holy scripture, he took Jewel with him, accompanied also with many other English exiles, who were supported by the liberal contribution of London Christians, until Bishop Gardiner, obtaining information of it, stopped the current of this Christian liberality, by imprisoning and impoverishing their benefactors. But the God whom they served was graciously pleased to raise up a friend for the exiles in Christopher, prince of Wirtemberg, who invited many of them to him, and afforded them bountiful supplies, as did also the Tigrine senators towards the rest. The great ornament of the reformed church, Calvin, Zuinglius, Melancthon, and others, manifested the tenderest sympathy towards their suffering English brethren, and afforded them constant encouragement and comfort by their letters. Jewel resided for a considerable time at the house of Peter Martyr, endeavouring, by every means in his power, to allay the contentions which arose about ceremonies and forms of religion among his countrymen in exile.

The death of Queen Mary afforded Jewel an opportunity of returning to his native land, and very soon after his return he was sent for to a disputation at Westminster. His next important commission was to visit the Western circuit, in order to investigate the state of religion, and to preach the gospel. On his return from this visitation, he was consecrated bishop of Salisbury, which preferment he accepted with great reluctance, after repeating the apostle's words, "He that desireth a bishopric desireth a good work." The liberality of Bishop Jewel was remarkable, and his labour in study, preaching, and writing, almost

incredible. He was much occupied in disputing with the papists, both with his tongue and with his pen. A lasting memorial of his zeal and ability in controversy, remains to speak his fame to many generations,—‘His Defence of the Apology of the Church of England.’ His excessive labour hastened his death, which took place in 1571, in the 50th year of his age. He was occupied in his great work of preaching almost till the day of his departure. The last exercise in which he was engaged exemplified the deep concern he felt to be found faithful. Having, after his return from a conference in London, commenced a visitation throughout his diocese, in which, with more severity than he had ever exercised before, he reproved the vices both of the clergy and of the laity, and preached oftener, which greatly enfeebled his constitution, he was recommended by a gentleman to return home and rest his body for his health’s sake; but he could not be persuaded to spare himself, using this remarkable expression—“It becometh a bishop to die preaching in the pulpit.” He went on, therefore, on horseback to preach at Lacock in Wiltshire, and in a state of great exhaustion ascended the pulpit, and preached his last sermon from Gal. v. 16, ‘Walk in the Spirit.’ He went from the pulpit to his bed, and in a few days expired. His closing scene was worthy of his character and of his life, and illustrated the reality and the strength of his faith.

Archbishop Parker.

BORN A. D. 1504.—DIED A. D. 1575.

MATTHEW PARKER, the second protestant archbishop of Canterbury, was born in the parish of St Saviour’s, Norwich, on the 6th of August, 1504. In 1521, he was admitted of Corpus Christi college, Cambridge, of which house he was chosen scholar, or bible-clerk, six months after. In 1526, he was made sub-deacon. While at college, he had for his contemporaries, Nicholas Bacon and Cecil, Bradford and Ridley. In 1527, he was ordained priest, and elected to a fellowship. His studies appear at this time to have been mainly directed towards the Scriptures and the writings of the early fathers; but his scholarship was in such repute that Cardinal Wolsey invited him to join his new foundation at Oxford,—an invitation which he declined at the same time with his distinguished predecessor in the archbishopric, Cranmer.

In 1533, the archbishop of Canterbury granted Parker a license to preach throughout his province, and the king gave him a patent for the same throughout the kingdom. He now preached frequently before the court, and at St Paul’s cross, and other public places. His zeal for the promotion of religion and learning recommended him to the intimacy and friendship of such men as Bilney, Stafford, Arthur, Friar Barnet, Scroode, Fowke, and other leading scholars and reformers. For Bilney, in particular, he cherished so great veneration that he went down to Norwich to attend him at his martyrdom, and afterwards fearlessly vindicated the memory of his murdered friend against the impeachment of Sir Thomas More, who asserted that, when brought

to the stake, Bilney had renounced his protestant principles, and expressed his adherence to the Romish church. Queen Anne Boleyn appointed Parker her own chaplain, and, a short time before her death, committed her daughter Elizabeth to his especial charge, enjoining him never to withhold from the young princess his pious and prudent counsel, and charging her to bear in remembrance her benefactor, if it should ever be in her power to reward his fidelity.

In 1535, he proceeded B. D., and, in the same year, was preferred by the queen to the deanery of the college of Stoke-Clare, in Suffolk. This place afforded him an agreeable retirement for the pursuit of his favourite studies. His friend, Dr Hadden, used to call it Parker's Tusculanum. It is not quite certain at what time Parker first imbibed the principles of the reformers, but soon after he began to preach in public we find articles exhibited against him by some of the more zealous papists. On the death of Queen Anne, Henry appointed him one of his chaplains, and nominated him to a prebend of Ely. In 1544, he was promoted to the mastership of Corpus Christi college, Cambridge, on the special recommendation of the king. In this office he zealously applied himself to reform and correct abuses; he also undertook the revisal of the statutes, which, with the countenance of his friend, Dr May, he reduced to nearly their present form. In 1547, he married Margaret, daughter of Robert Harlstone, of Mattis hall, in Norfolk, to whom he had been long attached. Mr Masters conjectures that it was about this time he drew up a short treatise, still preserved in the library of his college, '*De conjugio Sacerdotum.*' On the occasion of Kett's rebellion, Dr Parker, happening to be on a visit to his friends at Norfolk, did eminent service to the government, by his exhortations and services; he even ventured into the camp of the rebels, and boldly inveighed against the sin of rebellion, charging them with disloyalty to God as well as to the king, and exhorting them to return to their allegiance, and disperse quietly. On the death of Bucer, who had long lived on terms of intimate friendship with Parker, the latter preached his funeral sermon. It was afterwards printed, and is much superior to the ordinary compositions of the day.

A variety of promotions were conferred upon Parker during the reign of Henry. It is even said that he had the offer of a bishopric, but declined it. The accession of Mary changed the face of his fortunes. In common with the other married clergy who would not put away their wives, he was stripped of all his preferments. But he bore his reverse of fortune with firm resignation. Strype quotes a MS. in the college library, which says of Parker at this period, that he "lurked secretly in those years (the reign of Queen Mary) within the house of one of his friends, leading a poor life, without any man's aid or succour; and yet so well-contented with his lot, that, in that pleasant rest and leisure for his studies, he would never, in respect of himself, have desired any other kind of life, the extreme fear of danger only excepted." Either from the remissness of his enemies, or the kindness of his friends, he succeeded in secretting himself in these peculiar times, being, says Middleton, "reserved for better days." Among other treatises which employed his pen during this interval, was one in defence of priests' marriages against a book by Dr Martin. It was printed without his name, in 1562.¹ He also

¹ Strype, p. 504.

translated the book of Psalms into metre, which was afterwards printed, probably in 1567. This book—which Strype says he never could get a sight of—is divided into three *quingenes*, with the argument of each psalm in metre placed before it, and a suitable collect at the end of each. Some copies of verses, and transcripts from the fathers and others, on the use of the psalms, are prefixed to it, with a table dividing them into *Propheticæ, Eruditorii, Consolatorii, &c.* And, at the end, are added eight several tunes, with alphabetical tables to the whole.

On the accession of Elizabeth, Parker left his retreat, and was sent for to town by his old acquaintance and college-fellow, Sir Nicholas Bacon, now lord-keeper. For a considerable time he resisted the lord-keeper's invitations; but it had been resolved to elevate him to the primacy, and after extorting an unwilling consent from him, he was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury on the 17th of December, 1559. The subsequent history of Archbishop Parker is that of the church of England.

His first care was to have the several sees filled with learned and pious men. In this particular, he exercised a most wholesome influence on the state of religion throughout the kingdom, for it has been observed, that during the fifteen years of his primacy, he either consecrated or confirmed the bishops of all the dioceses in England,—a circumstance which has occurred to him alone of all the archbishops of Canterbury. He was also eminently useful in filling the chairs of the several colleges with men of sound learning and principles. Soon after his consecration, he received a letter from the celebrated Calvin, urging him to entreat her majesty to summon a general assembly of all the protestant clergy, for the settlement of some uniform plan of church discipline and service. Parker laid the venerable reformer's letter before the council, who directed him to return thanks for the communication, but to signify that they were resolved to abide by episcopacy in ecclesiastical affairs. In 1561, he united with some of the other prelates in an application to the queen, against the use of images. Their remonstrance succeeded upon this point, but he was less successful in his attempts to overcome the queen's repugnance to the marriage of the clergy. On one occasion in particular, she so ruffled the archbishop's temper on this point, that in a fit of chagrin and vexation, he addressed a letter to Secretary Cecil, in which he protests that her majesty's behaviour to him had quite indisposed him for all business, and that if she went on as she had threatened to force the clergy to any sinful compliance, he and others would obey God rather than man, and he trusted would have conscience and courage enough to embrace the stake rather than deny their faith, by pronouncing that unlawful which the Scriptures permitted and enjoined. It was with nearly equal difficulty that our archbishop moderated betwixt the queen and the clergy in the matter of ecclesiastical habits. By virtue of a clause in the act of uniformity, which gave the queen a power of enjoining any other rites or ceremonies she pleased, she sent forth her injunctions that the clergy should wear seemly garments, square caps, and copes. Many conformed to her majesty's wishes in this respect; but others, who were of opinion that popery might consist in dress as well as doctrine, declined to wear the cap and surplice. Hereupon the queen ordered the archbishops to confer with her ecclesiastical commissioners with the view of establishing and maintaining an exact order and uniformity in all external rites and

ceremonies of the church, and Parker accordingly drew up ordinances for the due order in preaching and administering the sacraments, and for the apparel of persons ecclesiastical. But the puritan party, headed by Dudley, earl of Leicester, stoutly resisted the execution of the ordinances, and Elizabeth herself—overcome by the arguments of her favourite—refused to sanction them for a time. They were at last published under the name of ‘advertisements;’ and he then proceeded to enforce them with a zeal which procured for him from one party the name and reproach of being a persecutor, and from another the title and reputation of a friend and supporter of the church of England. He continued to struggle with the difficulties attending his office and the spirit of the times, until his 71st year. He died on the 17th of May, 1575.

Parker’s learning has never been disputed. His extensive liturgical reading pointed him out as one of the fittest persons for drawing up the book of common prayer, in which he accordingly had a principal hand. He was mainly instrumental in procuring the publication of ‘the Bishop’s Bible,’ as it was called, which was undertaken and carried on under his direction and inspection. He edited the histories of Matthew of Westminster, and Matthew of Paris, and various other historical works which are enumerated by Tanner. The work on which he is generally supposed to have spent most of his time, was that ‘*De antiquitate Britanniae ecclesiae*.’ It is doubtful, however, what share he had in this book: probably he did little more than plan it, and supply his assistants with materials from his own valuable collection of ecclesiastical antiquities. The original work is exceedingly rare, but a very elegant edition of it was published by Dr Drake in 1729. He had the taste and spirit of an antiquary, and was very useful in reviving the study of the Saxon language, from which he executed some translations. Middleton says of him: “he was pious, sober, temperate, modest even to a fault, being upon many occasions over-bashful,—unmoveable in the distribution of justice,—a great patron and zealous defender of the church of England, in which he acted with great resolution, it being his rule ‘in a good cause to fear nobody.’”

Richard Cox, D.D.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1500.—DIED A. D. 1581.

THE patronage of Wolsey first brought this ecclesiastic into notice. He was born of mean parentage at Whaddon in Buckinghamshire; but having been sent to Eton school, was elected thence to King’s college, where he attracted the cardinal’s attention, who placed him on his new foundation at Oxford. His learning commanded the esteem of the university; but, having spoken rather freely in favour of the reformed doctrines, he was glad to exchange his fellowship for the mastership of Eton school. The interest of Crammer at last obtained for him some dignified appointments in the church, and he was appointed one of Prince Edward’s tutors. In this latter situation, he rose rapidly in favour at court, and in 1547 was elected chancellor of Oxford. It is said that, as one of the commissioners appointed to visit and report upon the state of the universities, he inflicted severe injury on the

public libraries by destroying a great number of books in his zeal against popery ; but, if he hurt these seminaries of learning in this instance, he amply atoned for the loss inflicted on them by obtaining exemption for them from the operation of several acts levelled against the property of kindred institutions.

On Mary's accession, Cox retired with other exiles to Strasburg. From this place he proceeded to Frankfort, where he got involved in a violent quarrel with some of his countrymen, who had shown a disposition to adopt the form of worship instituted by the reformers of Geneva. The magistrates of that city supported Cox, who had the satisfaction to see the books of common prayer forced upon his countrymen, and his principal antagonist among the refugees, the celebrated John Knox, driven in disgrace from the city on a charge preferred by Cox of having libelled the emperor. After a victory so little honourable to himself, Cox returned to Strasburg, where he employed himself more laudably in organising a kind of university for the benefit of his countrymen in that city.

On the demise of Mary, Cox returned to England, and was one of those divines who were appointed to revise the liturgy ; he also appeared on the protestant side in the great disputation held at Westminster between eight catholics and an equal number of the reformed clergy. His well-tryed zeal for the church of England, his learning, his abilities as a preacher, and his sufferings for the faith, recommended him to the patronage of Elizabeth, who bestowed on him the bishopric of Ely. This preferment proved a fertile source of uneasiness to him, for his high notions as to the prerogatives of the clergy, and his strenuous opposition to whatever savoured in the remotest degree of papistry, even in the arrangements of the queen's private chapel, brought him into frequent collision with the rapacious courtiers of Elizabeth, and involved his old age in a series of troubles and contentions. Wearied out, he at last consented to resign his bishopric, upon an annual pension of £200 ; but the court found it impossible to prevail on any respectable ecclesiastic to accept of the see during the lifetime of the proper incumbent ; and he accordingly retained it till his death, which happened in 1581. Bishop Cox was the author of several short pieces. He had also a principal hand in compiling the liturgy of the church of England ; and when the new translation of the bible, commonly known by the name of 'the Bishop's Bible,' was made in the reign of Elizabeth, the four Gospels, the Acts, and the epistle to the Romans, were assigned to him.

Bernard Gilpin.

BORN A. D. 1517.—DIED A. D. 1583.

THIS excellent man was born at Kentmire in Westmoreland in the year 1517. He studied at Queen's college, Oxford, and made great proficiency in the logic and philosophy of the day, in so much that he was chosen, while yet a very young man, to oppose the introduction of the reformed doctrines into the university by disputing with Hooper and Peter Martyr in public. For this task he was better qualified than

many others, having paid much attention to the Scriptures themselves, and possessing a critical acquaintance with the Hebrew and Greek languages. But the more he read of the Scriptures, the less confidence did he entertain in the tenets he was engaged to support. This state of mind greatly indisposed him to enter the lists with Peter Martyr; but he resolved that at least he would use the disputation as a means of fairly testing the soundness of his own opinions. Truth was, indeed, the sole object of his pursuit, and in this respect his candour and ingenuousness furnish a striking contrast to the perverseness and bigotry of most of the other impugnors of the new doctrines. Martyr himself bears ample testimony to the worth of his young opponent: "For my other hot-headed adversaries," he writes, "I am not much concerned for them, but I am troubled for Gilpin, for he speaks and acts with a singular uprightness of heart." A diligent study of the controversy at last determined him to withdraw from the Romish communion.

Gilpin continued at Oxford till the year 1552, when he was presented by Edward VI. with the vicarage of Norton in the county of Durham, and also obtained, what was granted only to a few—a general license for preaching throughout the country. Soon after entering upon his charge, he felt himself so much embarrassed by doctrinal difficulties, that he resolved to seek the resolution of his doubts by conference with the most eminent foreign divines, both catholic and protestant. But as no excuse appeared to him sufficient to justify non-residence in his parish, he resigned his living to a friend before taking his departure for the continent. His maternal uncle, Tunstal, bishop of Durham, viewed his act of resignation as a piece of folly and imprudence. Gilpin excused himself by remarking, that he could not retain the living and his peace of conscience too. "Conscience!" rejoined the bishop, "you might have had a dispensation!" "But I was afraid," rejoined Gilpin, "that when I came before the tribunal of Christ, it would not serve my turn to plead a dispensation for not having done my duty to my flock."

On landing in Holland, Gilpin went first to Mechlin, where his brother George then was pursuing the study of the civil law. George was at this time a zealous catholic, but the visit of Bernard produced an entire revolution in his opinions, and he became soon afterwards one of the warmest advocates for the Reformation. He was subsequently much employed in diplomatic negotiation during Queen Elizabeth's reign, and was highly esteemed both for abilities and integrity. On the accession of Queen Mary, Bernard was offered promotion by his relative, Tunstal, who was now again in power, but he respectfully declined the proffered favour, not being yet able to undertake the duties of office in person. After an absence of three years, he returned to his native country. His friends tried to dissuade him from this step, for the Marian persecution still raged; but he was nothing daunted by their representations, and fearlessly pursued what appeared to him the path of duty. His uncle received him with cordiality, and presented him with the archdeaconry of Durham and rectory of Easington. He entered upon his charge with an inflexible determination not only to do his duty to his parishioners, but in the performance of his archdeaconal functions, to omit no opportunity of bearing testimony against the corrupt principles and scandalous lives of the clergy.

Such conduct soon procured for him the dislike and opposition of the majority of his clerical brethren, who pronounced him "an enemy of the church and clergy, and a broacher of new and dangerous doctrines." For a time his uncle's influence served to protect him, but he was at last obliged to yield to the clamours of his adversaries and resign his archdeaconry. He would have kept his parochial charge, but his uncle refused to separate the two livings; he, however, bestowed on him the valuable rectory of Houghton-le-Spring, which afforded him a sphere of action exactly suited to the turn of his mind. It was an extensive charge, and one of the most ignorant districts in the whole country. Gilpin applied himself with his usual earnestness and assiduity to his new task, and met with his usual reward: the people admired and loved him, while the priests raised a clamour of heresy against him. He was in a short time cited to appear before Bonner, bishop of London, but the death of Queen Mary put a stop to the proceedings of his enemies, and gave him full liberty to pursue his benevolent plans.

At the recommendation of the earl of Bedford, he was now nominated to the bishopric of Carlisle, but he declined the honour, on the ground that he was wholly unequal to the station. The earl employed Dr Sandys, bishop of Worcester, to overcome his scruples, but without success. In the following year, he also declined the provostship of Queen's college, Oxford. He died on the 4th of March, 1583, after a life spent in such unwearied efforts of benevolence and apostolic charity, as to gain for him the honourable titles of 'Father of the Poor,' and 'Apostle of the North.'

Archbishop Grindal.

BORN A. D. 1519.—DIED A. D. 1583.

EDMUND GRINDAL was born at Hensingham, in Cumberland, in 1519, and was sent to Magdalen college, whence he removed to Christ's college, and to Pembroke-hall, Cambridge, where he was chosen fellow, and took his degrees. In 1548, he was appointed senior proctor to the university, and, in the following year, he was chosen Lady Margaret's preacher. He became acquainted with Dr Ridley, bishop of London, who appointed him his chaplain, and elected him to the precentorship of St Paul's. He was next made chaplain to King Edward, and, in 1552, he obtained a stall at Westminster Abbey. After King Edward's death he fled to the continent, and remained there until the death of Queen Mary. On the accession of Elisabeth, he returned to his native land, and soon obtained the notice of the leading friends of the Reformation. He was engaged in preparing the new liturgy which was to be presented to the queen's first parliament. Not long after, he was intrusted with the appointment of one of the commissioners for the royal visitation in the north, who were directed to require the oath of supremacy, to inspect cathedrals, to notice the manners of the clergy, and to destroy the superstitions, images, &c.

In 1562, the cruel Bonner was deposed from the bishopric of London, and Grindal was nominated to fill the vacant see. He was then ap-

pointed one of the queen's ecclesiastical commissioners, and in conjunction with the archbishops of Canterbury, reformed the calendar, and ordered that the ten commandments should be set up at the east end of every church in the kingdom. In 1564, when some of the leading prelates began to display the spirit of domination over conscience, Bishop Grindal was ordered by the queen and Archbishop Parker, to prosecute all those who would not comply with the act of uniformity. He obeyed the mandate, but with so much gentleness and forbearance, that Archbishop Parker complained of him to the queen, who sent him a special letter, commanding him to be diligent in punishing all recusants. In 1570, he was translated to the archbishopric of York, a charge which he found exceedingly burdensome. On the death of Archbishop Parker, he was advanced to the see of Canterbury. Happy would it have been for the established church, had all those persons who possessed power and influence, been of the same character and governed by the same principles as our archbishop. He was deeply anxious to fill the episcopal pulpits with men of piety and of talent, but the 'head of the church' was of another spirit, and was more solicitous that her mandate should be implicitly obeyed, than that the people should enjoy the faithful dispensation of the gospel. The same year in which he entered on the see of Canterbury, he held a convocation, in which some articles for the regulation of the church were agreed upon. They were entitled 'Articles touching the admission of apt and fit persons to the ministry, and the establishment of good order in the churches.' In 1576, the encouragement he gave to what was called, 'the exercise of prophesying,' displeased the queen. It appears strange that those meetings which were so directly intended and adapted to promote solid knowledge and evangelical preaching among his clergy, and consequently the truest interest of the laity, should have brought upon him the frowns of his sovereign. These 'prophesyings,' as they were called, were simply meetings of the clergy, under the superintendence of the archbishop, at which, each in his turn explained some portion of scripture, when a moderator made his observations on what had been said and determined its true sense. The queen, however, viewed these meetings as seminaries of puritanism, and took so rooted a dislike to them, that she desired their entire abolition, and gave orders to that effect to Archbishop Grindal. Instead, however, of implicitly obeying her majesty's commands, which he felt to be in opposition to the rights of conscience and the will of God, he wrote a letter to her, in which he remonstrated with her, and exhorted her to leave religious affairs to the bishops and divines of the realm, and not to decide on them in the same peremptory manner as in civil affairs. This letter highly displeased Elizabeth, who knew no law but her own will, and after reiterating her commands, she caused an order to be sent from the star-chamber which confined him to his house, and sequestered him from his office for six months. The honest archbishop did not choose to comply, and on an application from the lord-treasurer, his sequestration was continued, and some thoughts were entertained of deposing him. This project was, however, laid aside; yet the sequestration was not taken off until 1582, in which year he lost his sight and resigned his dignity. He obtained the promise of a pension from the queen, but never regained her favour. He died at Croydon in 1583. He was a man far in advance of the intoler-

ant times in which he lived. He was a prelate of profound learning, deep piety and admirable moderation ; mild, affable and generous,—he was universally admired, respected, and beloved by all his protestant brethren. He assisted the French protestants in obtaining permission to open a church in London, which was the origin of the present French church in Threadneedle-street. He was the author of ‘A Dialogue between Custom and Truth,’ published in Fox’s Acts and Monuments.

John Fox.

BORN A. D. 1517.—DIED A. D. 1587.

THIS eminent martyrologist was born of respectable parents at Boston in Lincolnshire, in 1517, that memorable year in which Luther commenced his attack on the papacy. His father died when he was young, and his mother being married again, his early education was intrusted to his father-in-law. When sixteen years old, he was entered at Brazen-nose college, Oxford, and at the early age of 21, was admitted to the degree of bachelor of arts. His talents and his extraordinary acquirements, the fruit of unwearied industry, soon recommended him to general notice, and in 1543 he became M. A. and was elected fellow of Magdalen college. In his youth, he displayed considerable aptness for poetry,—a talent which he exercised in the composition of several Latin plays, founded on sacred history. The one which attracted the most notice, was entitled, ‘De Christo Triumphante,’ 8vo. published in London 1551, and at Basil 1556. It was afterwards translated by Richard Day, son of the great printer, in the reign of Elizabeth, under the title of ‘Jesus Christ Triumphant ; wherein is described the glorious triumph and conquest of Christ over sin, death, and the law,’ &c. The original work has been much admired for its elegant Latinity. But divinity was the great object to which Mr Fox directed his attention. For a considerable period after entering the university, he remained a papist. This was partly the effect of ignorance, partly of prejudice. Neither ignorance nor prejudice, however, could keep him long from the truth. The ardour with which he devoted himself to theological studies corrected the former, and his candour enabled him to triumph over the latter. The diligence with which he devoted himself to the study of every branch of theology, was, indeed, most astonishing. Of this his son, who wrote his life, has given us a most memorable proof. He tells us that his father, before he was thirty years of age, had read over all the Greek and Latin fathers, the schoolmen, and the proceedings of the councils and consistories. Such an extensive course of reading, he thought no more than a proper preparation for forming a judgment on the controversies which then agitated the church. In the course of his studies, he became completely convinced of the errors of the Romish church ; nor did he stop here,—the same honesty and candour of mind, and the same unflinching spirit of inquiry which had reclaimed him from popery, led him to see the errors of the English church. He did not escape the suspicious eyes of his bigotted contemporaries. As he was too open to disavow or disguise his change of sentiments, his enemies

soon had an opportunity of satisfying their suspicions. In 1545, accordingly, a charge of heresy was brought against him, which terminated in his being convicted of the crime, and in his expulsion from his house,—a very gentle commutation of punishment, as it was generally thought, for the death which such atrocious guilt undoubtedly merited. Thus a mark of infamy was set upon him; his friends forsook him, not daring to hold intercourse with a heretic; and, what was worse than all, his father-in-law basely took advantage of his helpless situation to deprive him of his patrimony. He was thus reduced to the most abject want, but, at length, obtained a situation, however, in the house of Sir Thomas Lucy of Warwickshire, as the tutor of his children, where he continued till his pupils grew up. It was during his stay here that he married the daughter of a citizen of Coventry. The house of his wife's father afforded him a refuge for a considerable time after he left Sir Thomas Lucy's. He then came to London, where he was again exposed to all the hardships of the most cruel poverty. He was, at length, taken into the family of the duchess of Richmond, as tutor to her brother's children, Henry Howard, earl of Surrey, who was thrown into the Tower by the despotic Henry.

In this family living at Ryegate in Surrey, he remained during the rest of Henry's reign, the few years of Edward's and part of Mary's. He was nobly protected by the duke of Norfolk, and according to Wood, was even restored to his fellowship in Magdalen college. The hateful Gardiner, however, now fixed his malignant eye upon him and made every effort to entrap him. The bishop was particularly intimate with the duke of Norfolk, and was incessantly asking that nobleman to introduce him to his tutor. This request was as constantly evaded. At length when the duke saw that his protection would no longer be of any avail, he told Fox they must part, at the same time furnishing him with the means of transporting himself to a foreign land. With this Fox readily complied; but as, before he could embark, his bloody persecutor had a warrant out against him, it was with the utmost difficulty that he accomplished his object. At length he succeeded in reaching Nieuport in Flanders in safety; thence he journeyed to Antwerp, Strasburgh, and Basil. At this last place he maintained himself by correcting the press for Oporinus, the celebrated printer; and there too he meditated his great work—the 'Acts and Monuments of the churches.' During his exile, he united himself with those fellow-sufferers, who, renouncing the service-book of King Edward, had adopted the peculiarities of the school of Geneva.

At the accession of Elizabeth, and the consequent restoration of the protestant religion, Fox returned to England, where he was heartily welcomed by his former pupil—now fourth duke of Norfolk—from whom he received a pension. The secretary, Cecil, also, obtained for him a prebend in the church of Salisbury. He had many powerful friends, as the names of Grindal, Walsingham, Drake, Gresham, abundantly prove; and if he would have dropped his Geneva peculiarities, there was no preferment which he might not have hoped for. But he was one of the few who will not pay the price of conscience for honours and emoluments, however splendid. Of this we have two or three striking instances. When Archbishop Parker summoned him to subscribe, the venerable man took out a Greek Testament and said, "To this will I

subscribe." When told he must subscribe to the canons, he refused, saying, "I have nothing but a prebend at Salisbury, and if you like to take it away, much good may it do you." As the greater part of the bishops had been his fellow-exiles, and had been taught moderation by suffering, they no longer molested him. He, on the other hand, conducted himself with much prudence and circumspection, openly condemning the violence of some of the more zealous puritans. In 1575, he addressed to the queen his memorable memorial on behalf of the German anabaptists, who had refused to join either the Dutch or English church, and the cruel persecution of whom is one of the darkest blots on the history of protestantism. Fox's petition was rejected—but it did him infinite honour.

Though Mr Fox held nothing in the church but the prebend, of which we have already made mention, he took every opportunity of preaching and doing good. His vast learning, sincere piety and humility, commended him to universal esteem. He died in 1587, in the seventieth year of his age.

Of the numerous works which Mr Fox published, by far the greater part were on controversial theology or ecclesiastical history. The work, however, on which his fame rests, is his 'History of the Acts and Monuments of the Church,' commonly called, the 'Book of Martyrs,' and on the composition of this work he spent many years of unwearied labour. Whitgift says, that Mr Fox "laboured very diligently and faithfully in this matter, and searched out the truth of it as learnedly as any man has done." In the compilation of this work, Mr Fox was furnished with every facility by Grindal and many other influential friends. It was first published in one volume folio, 1563, and so eagerly was it read, that in 1583 a fourth edition was required.

The protestants, of course, valued this work highly; while the papists did all they could to depreciate its merits and to check its circulation. They called it the 'Golden Legend,' and represented it as a tissue of lies and slander. This was natural in catholics; but there have also been professed protestants, who have endeavoured to discredit it. Collier, in his ecclesiastical history, has accused our martyrologist of bigotry, disingenuousness, and using violent language. That his language is here and there coarse and bitter, is only saying that Fox was not entirely free from the faults which characterized all the controversialists of the age; and to say that there are mistakes in the work, is saying no more than that its author was fallible. In a work of such extent, it is impossible to avoid some errors; at the same time, there is not the slightest proof that Fox designedly misrepresented facts, while there is every proof that he consulted with prodigious labour every accessible authority and used his materials in the greatest fairness. The praise of such competent judges as Burnett and Strype, is enough to establish his character for accuracy and impartiality; and that has been most abundantly bestowed. "Mr Fox," says Strype, "must not go without the commendation of a most painful searcher into records, archives, and repositories of original acts and letters of state, and a great collector of MSS. And the world is infinitely beholden to him for abundance of extracts thence, communicated to us in his volumes. And as he hath been found most diligent, so most strictly true and faithful in his transcriptions."

Cardinal Allen.

BORN A. D. 1532.—DIED A. D. 1594.

WILLIAM ALLEN, cardinal priest of the Roman church, was born at Rossal in Lancashire, in the year 1532. His father, John Allen, was a gentleman of good family and some fortune, by whom his education was carried on till he reached his fifteenth year, when he sent him to Oxford, where, in 1547, he was entered of Oriel college, and had Morgan Philip, or Philip Morgan, for his tutor. Under him he studied with great success, especially addicting himself to logic and philosophy, in which he became so great a proficient, that he was unanimously chosen fellow of his college, and took the degree of bachelor of arts in 1550, being esteemed an honour to the university on account of his great parts, learning, and eloquence. In 1556, he became principal of St Mary's hall, and in that and the following year, one of the proctors of the university, being then only twenty-four years of age. In 1558, he was made one of the canons of York, but, on Queen Elizabeth's accession, he, as a zealous catholic, lost all hopes of preferment, and, therefore, in 1560, withdrew to Louvain in the Spanish Netherlands, where an English college was erected, of which he became the principal support. At this time, several persons of great learning, and some of the boldest champions of the popish cause, resided in this place, with whom he quickly grew into great esteem, by the strength of his genius and the politeness of his manners. The gracefulness of his person, it is said, contributed much to obtain the attention of his associates, for with a majestic presence, he had an easy, affable deportment, and with the greatest severity of manners, a mildness of speech and behaviour which won the affection of all who conversed with him. Here he began to write in support of the catholic cause, and his first piece was against a work written by the learned Bishop Jewel, on the subject of 'Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead.' The chiefs of the party abroad conceived the greatest hopes of this new disputant; and as a mark of their confidence, put under his care a young man of an honourable family, who was come to study at Louvain.

The care he took of this young pupil, and his application to his other studies, so far undermined his health, that his physicians were of opinion that nothing could restore him but his native air. On this account, he ventured into England in 1565, and went at first, as advised by his doctors, into Lancashire, where he was born. There, without any regard to his personal safety, he laboured, to the utmost of his power, in making converts, and in dissuading such as were already catholics from going to heretical conventicles, that is, to the established churches. He wrote and distributed several little pieces, which were afterwards printed, and by so doing, rendered himself obnoxious to the government. Strict search was made after him by the magistrates, and he was obliged to conceal himself sometime in the neighbourhood of the city of Oxford. In this retreat, he wrote an apology for his party, under the title of 'Brief Reasons concerning the Catholic Faith.' Some say this was written at the house of the duke of Norfolk, where, in Norfolk,

it is certain, our author was some time concealed, though he returned afterwards to the neighbourhood of Oxford again, where he distributed his work, to fix the minds of such as wavered between the two religions, and to draw over such as already doubted their safety while remaining in the established church. Such success attended his endeavours, that he chose to remain in this dangerous situation, promoting, by every means in his power, the doctrine of popery, and the spiritual jurisdiction of his holiness, and such as derived their authority from him. He even ventured to open a correspondence with some of his old friends in the university, and amongst the rest, with one who had formerly been a catholic, but had since conformed to the established church, and whose friends entertained great hopes of his preferment. This person he drew back to his former opinions, which so exasperated his relations, that they persecuted Allen with so much diligence, that he was forced to fly towards London, and with much difficulty made his escape to Flanders in 1568, after remaining in England three years. In all probability he had some powerful friends here, amongst whom may be reckoned Sir Christopher Hatton, afterwards chancellor, who received part of his education at St Mary's hall, Oxford, while Allen was principal. On this account, Sir Christopher had a great tenderness for Allen's person. After his return to the continent, he went to Mechlin, in the duchy of Brabant, where he read a divinity lecture in a certain monastery there, with great applause. Thence he went to Douay, where he became doctor of divinity, and laboured very assiduously in establishing a seminary for English scholars. While thus employed, he became canon of Cambray,—a very considerable and honourable preferment, conferred on him purely to reward his zeal in the service of the catholic church. In this seminary of Douay, many books were composed to justify the popish religion, and to answer works written in defence of the church of England, which occasioned Queen Elizabeth to issue a proclamation, forbidding such books to be sold or read. In 1569, our author appointed one Bristow, moderator of studies at Douay. It is probable that this was the person he drew over to his opinions when in England. Not long after, Dr Allen was appointed canon of Rheims, through the interest of the Guises, and to that city he removed the seminary which had been settled at Douay. The reason of this was, that the then governor of the Netherlands, Don Lewis de Requesens, had obliged the English fugitives to withdraw out of his government. Henceforward, Dr Allen was considered the chief of the party, and in England was justly reputed a capital enemy to the state; all correspondence with him was looked upon as the highest kind of treason, and Thomas Alfield, a Jesuit, was actually executed for bringing some of his books into England. The celebrated Robert Parsons, the Jesuit, was Dr Allen's great friend and counsellor, and probably put him on that great project, which, had it succeeded, would have overwhelmed the English, and which, as it miscarried, greatly weakened the Spanish monarchy. Dr Allen and the fugitive noblemen from England, persuaded King Philip to undertake the conquest of their native country. To facilitate this project, the pope, Sextus V., was prevailed on to renew the excommunication thundered against Queen Elizabeth by his predecessor, Pius V.

Dr Allen wrote in defence of this base proceeding, and to give

greater weight to his writings, was created cardinal, by the title of St Martin in Montibus, and soon after, the king of Spain gave him an abbey of great value in the kingdom of Naples, with strong assurances of greater preferment. In 1588, he composed that work, which rendered him most famous abroad, and infamous at home. It consisted of two parts; the first explaining the pope's bull, for the excommunication and deprivation of Queen Elizabeth,—the second exhorting the nobility and people of England to desert her, and take up arms in favour of the Spaniards. Many thousand copies were printed at Antwerp, in order to have been put on board the Armada, that they might be dispersed by the papists all over England, upon the first landing of the Spaniards. On the failure of this expedition, these books were so carefully destroyed, that very few remained. A copy of this work, as soon as it was printed, was transmitted by some of the lord-treasurer's spies to the English council, and the queen in consequence sent Dr Dale into the Low Countries to complain of such proceedings to the prince of Parma, who disclaimed all knowledge of such books. In the same year the king of Spain promoted our author to the archbishopric of Mechlin in Flanders, where he would have had him constantly resident; but the pope having a high opinion of the cardinal's merit, and finding him of great use in consistories, would not suffer him to leave Rome. The remainder of his life he spent at Rome in great honour and reputation, living in much splendour, and using all his influence for the comfort and maintenance of such catholics as fled from England. In the last year of his life he is said to have changed his sentiments as to government, and to have been heartily sorry for the pains he had taken to promote the invasion of England by the Spaniards. He is generally said to have died of a retention of urine, but it was strongly suspected that he was poisoned by the Jesuits. His death took place on the 6th of October, 1594, in the sixty-third year of his age. He was buried with great pomp in the chapel of the English college at Rome, where a monument was erected to his memory.

In drawing the character of such a man, his admirers of the catholic profession are unbounded in their applauses of his zeal, his courage, his learning, his sacrifices, his consistency; on the other hand, with those who regard him as a vindictive and rebellious subject, and as a bigoted and cruel papist, who was deeply engaged in planning the invincible Armada, by which the rightful sovereign was to be dethroned, and the people of England subjected to the papal yoke, and by every instrument of torture, to be forced into an allegiance to King Philip or his holiness,—no terms seem too strong to express their abhorrence of his treason, and their detestation of his bigotry. How far he was influenced by his conscience, however deluded that conscience might have been, the day which shall reveal all secrets will determine. His zeal and activity in what as protestants we are bound to consider a bad cause, may however chide the lukewarmness and indolence of too many who despise the cardinal's religion, but appear to have far less estimation for their own, than he manifested for his.

Bishop Aylmer.

BORN A. D. 1521.—DIED A. D. 1594.

JOHN AYLMER, or, as he wrote it, Celmer, was descended from a very ancient family, seated at Aylmer Hall, in the county of Norfolk. He was born some time in the year 1521, and, by his great aptitude for learning, recommended himself early to Henry Grey, marquess of Dorset, afterwards duke of Suffolk, who called him his scholar, and gave him an exhibition at the university of Cambridge. After he had there attained a competent provision of university learning, the marquess took him into his own house, where he became tutor to his children. Lady Jane, who, for a few days, was styled queen, was one of his pupils. From her tutor she received right principles of religion. Mr Aylmer went early into the opinions of the reformers, and having the duke of Suffolk and the earl of Huntingdon for his patrons, he was, for some time, the only preacher in Leicestershire, in the reign of Edward VI. There he effectually fixed the protestant religion. His first preferment was the archdeaconry of Stow, in the diocese of Lincoln. This gave him a seat in the convocation held in the first year of Queen Mary, when he boldly opposed that return to popery to which the body of the clergy seemed inclined. He was one of the six who offered to dispute all the controverted points in religion against the most famous champions of the papists. When the supreme power began to use force instead of argument, the archdeacon made his escape beyond the sea. At first he resided at Strasburg, and afterwards at Zurich in Switzerland. His escape was almost miraculous, as the ship in which he was embarked was searched by the officers of the queen. During his exile, he diligently pursued his studies, and employed all his time in acquiring or communicating knowledge. About this time he wrote an answer to Knox's book against the government of women. After the accession of Elizabeth, he returned home, and was one of the eight divines appointed to dispute with as many popish bishops at Westminster. A. D. 1562, he obtained the archdeaconry of Lincoln, by the favour of Mr Secretary Cecil. This dignity gave him the right to sit in the famous synod held the same year, wherein the doctrine and discipline of the church, and its reformation from the abuses of popery, were carefully examined and settled. He was also appointed a justice of the peace, and an ecclesiastical commissioner. He obtained the degrees of bachelor and doctor in divinity in the university of Oxford, in October, 1573. In 1576, on the promotion of Dr Sandys to the archbishopric of York, Dr Aylmer was made bishop of London. His accession to this dignity was greatly furthered by his predecessor, who was his intimate friend, and had been his companion in exile. The conduct of Bishop Aylmer to this archbishop, after his promotion, was not very creditable to himself, for, although his Grace assisted at his consecration on the 24th March, 1576, immediately after his promotion, Bishop Aylmer sued him for dilapidations, which, after some years' prosecution, he recovered. On the 15th of December, our bishop began his first visitation, and the high church writers are very liberal in their

praises of the rigour of his proceedings towards those ministers who had too much conscience to subscribe. He appeared, indeed, to have forgotten that he was himself at one time an exile for conscience sake. He was, say his admirers, extremely assiduous in public preaching, and very careful in examining the candidates for ordination, while, at the same time, he kept a strict eye over all dissenters, as well as papists and puritans. The zeal of the bishop for the church as by law established, led him to some measures which exposed him to the charge of being a persecutor. He kept a straiter rein over the puritans than over the papists; imprisoned a printer, named Woodcock, for vending a treatise, entitled, 'An Admonition to Parliament;' and procured a gentleman in Berkshire, named Welden, to be committed by the ecclesiastical commissioners. These proceedings roused the puritans, who treated him as an enemy to true religion. The bishop was resolved to keep the clergy of his diocese in due subordination to episcopal authority. On Sunday, the 27th of September, 1579, they were summoned to his palace at one o'clock, and forty appeared, the dean was also present—when the bishop cautioned them of two things,—not to meddle with the Ubiquitarian controversy, nor with Stubb's book, entitled, 'The Discovery of a Gaping Gulph,' wherein the queen's marriage with the French king's brother was written against, and by which it was suggested the queen wavered in her religion. In 1581, the bishop had to contend with the Lord Rich who kept a puritan minister in his house, named Wright, whom he would have compelled the bishop to license to preach in his diocese. The bishop had 'the powers that be' on his side, in this struggle, and Wright was committed to the Fleet by the ecclesiastical commissioners. In 1583, he performed his triennial visitation, when he represented to the privy council many scandalous corruptions which he discovered in the ecclesiastical courts. About this time, he suspended certain ministers who were accused of nonconformity; and it appears that, after thorough examination of the matter, his lordship restored Mr Gifford, whom he had twice suspended, when those who brought the charges against him could not substantiate them. In 1584, he obtained judgment against Archbishop Sandys, for a thousand pounds. In this year, also, he committed to prison Mr Thomas Cartwright, the famous puritan minister, who had written warmly against the hierarchy. In 1587, the bishop had much trouble on account of a school-master, named Robert Cawdry, whom the Lord Burleigh had presented to the living of South Lufferton in Rutlandshire, where, after preaching sixteen years, he was convened before the ecclesiastical commission, the bishop sitting as judge, and by whom he was at length deprived. Cawdry would not submit to the sentence, upon which the matter was re-examined by the ecclesiastical commission, at Lambeth, by whom degradation was added to the former sentence. Cawdry still refused to submit to the sentence, and made fresh representations to Lord Burleigh, who favoured him as much as with justice he could; but, after a contest of five years, no redress could be obtained: the sentences of the bishop and archbishop being supported both by the civil and common lawyers. In 1591, he caused the famous and learned Mr Cartwright to be brought before him out of the Fleet, and expostulated with him in not very courteous language, on the disturbance he had occasioned to the church. The bishop was

now getting old and infirm, and was much disappointed in not obtaining the favour he strongly solicited on behalf of Dr Bullingham, Dr Cole, and Dr Bancroft, whom he wished to see preferred to bishoprics. It was his particular wish that Bancroft should succeed him, and, indeed, he solicited leave to resign his diocese to him. In 1592, the bishop assisted at the visitation of his son, as archdeacon of London, and exerted himself with as much zeal and spirit as he had ever manifested in his younger days. This is the last public act of the bishop's which we can trace; and, in 1594, he died, being seventy-three years of age.

The bishop had a numerous family: viz. seven sons and two or three daughters. As to his personal qualities, the voice of his friends or his enemies will bear a testimony in perfect contrast. He was well versed in the three learned languages, and was a good logician; was deeply read in history, and well skilled in civil law. His religion appeared to greatest advantage while he was a sufferer for conscience sake. When the sunshine of royal favour, and the good things of a national establishment were enjoyed by him, he was too much lifted up with pride, and discovered a degree of passion, intolerance, and oppression, which must excite a blush for human nature. The bishop bequeathed large legacies to his children, and also some to his grandchildren. The early part of his life seemed to give promise of a brighter character than his concluding years displayed. The champion of protestant principles and of civil and religious liberty dwindled down into the abettor of arbitrary measures, and the factious oppressor of his fellow-christians, setting the dictum of an earthly sovereign above the authoritative oracles of God.

Archbishop Whitgift.

BORN A. D. 1530.—DIED A. D. 1595.

JOHN WHITGIFT, archbishop of Canterbury, in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I., was of the family of the Whitgifts of Yorkshire, which boasted of considerable antiquity. His father, Henry, was a merchant of Great Grimsby in Lincolnshire. His uncle Robert, was Abbot de Wel-low, near Grimsby,—a monastery of Black canons. He was one among the many, who, just before the Reformation, began to see the enormous corruptions of the Romish church, and to anticipate the changes that were soon to take place. "The religion we profess," said he to the subject of this memoir, "cannot long continue; I have read the whole scripture through; but never found it sanctioned there." To this man—so much before the generality of his contemporaries—the education of Whitgift was intrusted.

The year of Whitgift's birth cannot be exactly ascertained. Strype and Paul fix it in 1530; Francis Thynne in 1533. The place of his birth all agree was Great Grimsby. When quite young, he was sent to St Anthony's school, in London. He lodged in St Paul's church-yard at his aunt's, the wife of a verger of that church. Here our young scholar displayed an unequivocal preference for the doctrines of the Reformation. This provoked his aunt, who was a most zealous catholic.

After bearing with his heresies for some time, and making some ineffectual attempts to correct them, she dismissed him, affectionately assuring him at parting, that "she thought, at first, her lodger was a saint,—but she now perceived he was a devil."

On his return home, his uncle advised that he should be sent to the university. In 1548, therefore, he was entered of Queen's college, Cambridge; but soon exchanged for Pembroke-hall. Here he enjoyed the instructions of the celebrated John Bradford, the martyr. At his recommendation and that of Mr Grindal, afterward archbishop of Canterbury, Whitgift became scholar of that town and Bible-clerk. In 1553-4, Whitgift took his degree of bachelor of arts. Another year saw him elected fellow of Peter-house; and in 1557, he commenced master of arts. About this time, Cardinal Pole visited the university, to make search for heretics, and to expel them. Whitgift, at first, thought of doing what so many of his countrymen were compelled to do both then and afterwards—seeking safety by self-banishment. At the solicitation of Dr Perne, however, a professed papist—who pledged himself for his safety, he ventured to remain. To the honour of Dr Perne—that pledge was fully redeemed. In 1560, Whitgift entered into holy orders, and his first sermon at St Mary's was heard with much approbation. A few months after this, he became chaplain to the bishop of Ely, who gave him the rectory of Feversham in Cambridgeshire. In 1563, he became bachelor of divinity, and succeeded Matthew Hutton, as Lady Margaret's professor of divinity. The lectures he delivered in this character, he prepared for the press; but for some unknown cause they were never published. Strype tells us, that he had seen the MSS. It was while thus engaged, that Whitgift joined the other professors in a petition to Sir W. Cecil for certain fresh regulations in reference to the election of the public officers of the university, the want of which had been much felt.

Not long after this, his fame as a preacher became so great, that Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Napier, sent for him to preach before the court. This ended in his becoming chaplain to the queen. Learning, in 1565, that some statutes enjoining uniformity of habits at the university, were about to be passed, he joined with others in writing to Cecil, to implore the court to desist. He soon had reason, however, to repent his temerity; and becoming an apt scholar as a courtier, not only apologized for this unlucky letter, but henceforth found that there was much more in hoods and surplices than he had been previously aware of. But so great a favourite did he continue at Cambridge, that a license to preach throughout the realm was granted to him under the common seal, and his salary raised from twenty marks to twenty pounds. About 1567, he was appointed regius professor of divinity in Pembroke-hall. He remained here, however, only three months, being promoted by the queen to the mastership of Trinity college. This he owed to the patronage of Sir William Cecil. Soon after this, he became doctor of divinity. In 1570, he compiled a body of laws for the university.

We now come to that part of Whitgift's life, which will ever be regarded as the deepest stain upon his character,—his ungenerous conduct towards his great antagonist, the celebrated puritan, Thomas Cartwright, at that time Margaret professor. Dr Whitgift procured an order from the vice-chancellor and heads of houses to forbid Cartwright

to read any more lectures, unless he would renounce his principles. Cartwright, of course, refused so mean a compliance, merely to save his professorship; preferring poverty with a safe conscience, to wealth or preferment without it. He justly complained, however, that this was but a miserable way of refuting his errors, if errors they were, and a clear substitution of authority for argument. Nevertheless, the strong arm of the law is assuredly the best reason which persecution was ever able to give. It would have been well for Whitgift's fame if he had stopped here, but in the controversy which afterwards ensued between him and his great antagonist, truth compels us to say, that he acted a yet more unworthy part; he had the meanness to reproach Cartwright with those very miseries of which he had himself been the cause. He upbraided him with living upon charity, when none knew better than himself who had robbed him of his honest livelihood,—and of indolence, when he had himself silenced him. The controversy, however, which had commenced with an exercise of arbitrary power, was to be carried on with other weapons. Stimulated by the charges of oppression which Cartwright hesitated not to make, Whitgift attempted a confutation of his opinions: this work he addressed to Archbishop Parker. It was not published, however, in the form in which it was composed; but was afterwards embodied in his 'Answer to the Admonition.' In 1571, he became vice-chancellor; in June, dean of Lincoln. Three months afterwards, he obtained a dispensation to hold with it his prebend of Ely and rectory of Feversham, and any benefice whatever. He was now, at the instance of the archbishop of Canterbury, engaged in the composition of his 'Answer to the Admonition.' The 'Admonition' was the first production of Field and Wilcox. In his reply to it, Whitgift received no small aid from Archbishop Parker and other learned men, so that this too may be almost considered as joint-production. To this performance—which undoubtedly displays great learning and no mean powers of reasoning—Cartwright replied in a work which has been called a masterpiece of controversy. In answer to this, with the promptitude which distinguished controvertists of those days, forth comes Whitgift's 'Defence,' folio, 1574. Cartwright, not a whit behind, sends forth the same year a quarto rejoinder, entitled 'The second reply of T. C. against Dr Whitgift's second answer touching church discipline.' This, however, only contained a part of his reply; the remainder was not published till two years after, during his banishment. To this book, Whitgift attempted no answer. For this, different writers, of course, assign opposite reasons; some affirming that the doctor thought it too contemptible to notice; others, with greater probability, that he found contempt more easy than refutation. Here ended the great controversy between these two champions. Of the respective merits of the disputants, persons will form very opposite estimates according to their opinion on the subjects of ecclesiastical government and discipline. As the controvertists, however, proceeded in two opposite principles, it was impossible they should ever convince each other. While Whitgift contended that, on the subject of church discipline and polity, the Scriptures were not a sufficient guide, but that their deficiencies must be eked out by the testimonies of the fathers and the traditions of the primitive ages; Cartwright, on the other hand, contended that the inspired writings were the only safe guide on these points,—that the fathers have too often and too glaringly

departed from Scripture even where its language was explicit, to warrant our following them as a guide where Scripture had not enjoined the opinions they adopted,—and that it was most safe for the church in all ages to conform itself, as nearly as possible, to the simplicity of the apostolic times. Of the talents and learning of both these disputants, there can be no doubt, though, from the testimony Beza gives concerning Cartwright, one would judge him to be the more profound scholar of the two. That the controversy was carried on with much asperity and personality on both sides must be admitted, while it must also be admitted, that Whitgift's ungenerous conduct in the first instance, and his unrelenting persecution afterwards, leaves no room to wonder that he was not treated with much ceremony or courtesy by one whom he had so deeply wronged. But that Whitgift should have descended to upbraid his adversary with poverty and insinuate suspicions of his learning, is not less wonderful than humiliating. The controversy issued of course in very different results to the two parties. While Whitgift was footing to an archbishopric, poor Cartwright was consigned to poverty, and exile; and at length died in obscurity and wretchedness. How pleasant would it have been to say—that none of his sufferings were inflicted by his great antagonist, but that he was treated by him with a generous magnanimity! Instead of this, Whitgift followed him through life with inflexible animosity.

At each successive promotion, Whitgift displayed an accession of high church zeal, became a greater stickler for existing abuses, and more completely versed in all the most approved methods of checking the progress of puritanism. The bishop of Ely having proposed a plan for abolishing pluralities, and appropriating part of the superfluous wealth of the dignitaries of the church to the maintenance of the poorer clergy, Dr Whitgift opposed and ultimately succeeded in defeating it. In 1577, he was made bishop of Worcester.

At this time Archbishop Grindal had given displeasure to the queen by his honest plain dealing, and his forbearance towards the puritans. Elizabeth—never very scrupulous where her ambition or thirst for vengeance were concerned—wished Whitgift to accept the see of Canterbury, even during Grindal's life. To the honour of Whitgift, he absolutely refused to accept this offer. As soon as Grindal died, which happened in 1583, Whitgift was immediately appointed his successor: and no sooner had he attained this elevated station than he began to correct the abuses, as he esteemed them, which his predecessor's leniency had encouraged—in other words, he proceeded to put into force all the formidable artillery against the puritans with which the law armed him. These unhappy men, on account of the indulgence which they had met with at the hands of Grindal, had sought his province as an asylum from persecution. For this blessed work of persecuting them, Whitgift obtained the queen's express orders. In 1563, he moved for an ecclesiastical commission; and in 1584, issued twenty-four articles, which he sent to the bishops of his province, commanding them to demand from all the suspected clergy of their respective dioceses an answer to all those articles upon oath, as well as to subscribe to the queen's supremacy, the book of common prayer, and the thirty-nine articles. Subscription to these three last articles was demanded during the very first week after the archbishop's primacy. He knew very well

that the second article would not be taken by the puritans ; and, consequently, at his very first invitation not less than 233 ministers were suspended. Repeated and urgent were the petitions of the people to the council, that their silenced pastors might be restored ; but the obdurate archbishop was not to be moved ; he resolutely opposed their petitions, and having obtained a new ecclesiastical commission, with more extensive powers, drew up the twenty-four articles above-mentioned. So minute and specific are these articles that it was impossible that any clergyman who had the slightest objection to a single point in the church of England could conscientiously swear to them. It was not without reason, therefore, that Lord Burleigh wrote an ex-postulatory letter to the archbishop. In this letter, his lordship does not scruple to say, "I have read over your 24 articles, formed in a Romish style, of great length and curiosity, &c., and I find them so curiously penned, so full of branches and circumstances, that I think the inquisition of Spain used not so many questions to comprehend and trap their priests." To this the archbishop replied at length, and of course in self-vindication. Finding him obstinate, the treasurer sent back only a short but very emphatic answer, which drew from his Grace another long letter. We cannot have a better proof than in this contrast between the practical wisdom of the statesman, and the unbending, impracticable pertinacity of the churchman, of the truth of what Clarendon remarks, "that no men take so ill a measure of human affairs as ecclesiastics." To justify his harsh and vigorous measures, Whitgift was obliged to recur to the more than doubtful precedents of the procedure in the star-chamber, the courts of the marches, &c. ; and to vindicate that oppressive expedient, the administering the oath *ex mero officio*, he tells us that if the dignitaries proceeded to the proof of delinquencies by witnesses only, the law could only be partially executed,—expenses would be heavy—and there would not be sufficiently quick despatch with the sectaries. No wonder that Cartwright found no mercy at the hands of such an opponent as this !

In 1585, Whitgift, by a special order from the queen, was employed to frame rules for the regulation of the press. In 1586, he was sworn into the privy council, soon after which he drew up the statutes of the cathedral-churches. In 1587, on the death of Sir Thomas Bromley, the lord chancellor, the queen offered Whitgift that high office. This he declined. In 1588, appeared the celebrated pamphlet, entitled 'Martin Mar-prelate,' in which the oppressive conduct of Whitgift is most severely exposed. Two years afterwards, his old opponent, Cartwright, was sent to the Fleet prison, chiefly for refusing to take the oath *ex officio*. In 1591, he was brought before the star-chamber, when, upon his giving bail for his peaceable behaviour, he was discharged.

In 1595, during an interval of partial repose from other disputes, the predestinarian controversy was agitated. It was at this time that Whitgift, in concert with Bancroft, bishop of London, Vaughan, bishop of Bangor, Tyndale, dean of Ely, and others, drew up the famous 'Lambeth Articles.' These articles are in the main in accordance with Calvinism. "I know them," said the archbishop, "to be sound doctrines." They were sent to Cambridge, with a letter from Whitgift, in which he recommended that nothing should be publicly taught to the contrary.

In 1595, he began to build his hospital at Croydon. This act of munificence did not meet with all the gratitude to which it was undoubtedly entitled, for it occasioned some calumnious reports of his Grace's inordinate wealth. This induced the bishop to give an account of his revenues, which proved satisfactory.

On the death of Elizabeth, Whitgift sent Dr Neil, dean of Canterbury, into Scotland, to James, to learn his pleasure touching the government of the church. Though the reply was gracious, the archbishop's fears were by no means removed; the puritans knew how James had been educated, and what he had promised, and openly expressed a hope of being released from fetters which had so long galled them. At length the celebrated Hampton court conference was appointed, at which the puritans were to state their grievances. Of the history and results of that conference we are not called here to speak. Suffice it to say, that Whitgift played the courtier on this occasion as well as he had before played the tyrant: it is impossible to say much more. The following may serve as a specimen:—When the king expressed his approbation of the law making the oath *ex officio*, he assured his majesty that he undoubtedly spoke “by the special assistance of God's Spirit!” Whitgift did not live long after this “mock conference,” as it has been justly styled. He was seized with a paralytic stroke, as he was going to the council chamber, and was conveyed to Lambeth, where, after lingering a few days, he died. Camden and Strype both intimate that grief for the state of the church, and fear of the efforts of the puritans, under a new king and a new parliament, had a share in his death. Any such distrust of the king, however, seems very improbable, for, as Strype has observed, “by what we have heard before related in the king's management of the conference, and the letter he himself wrote to the archbishop, he had a better satisfaction of the king's mind.”

Whitgift was interred in the parish church of Croydon, where a monument was erected to his memory.

To form a correct estimate of his character, requires both great candour and great discrimination. That he was exceedingly oppressive and tyrannical towards the puritans cannot admit of a doubt; yet it is but just to say, that he appears to have been actuated by integrity of purpose, and to have been sincerely convinced of the rectitude of his own conduct. It ought, moreover, in fairness, to be stated, that the zeal and rigour which marked the early part of his career, considerably abated towards the close of life. His learning, there cannot be a question, was great, though, by many, it has been overrated. It is well known that Hugh Broughton, the celebrated Hebræist, often objected to him, that he went no farther than the Latin, and, on the profounder points of theology, he appears to have been by no means well versed, though he is admitted by all to have been an eloquent and powerful preacher. His fame chiefly rests, however, on his knowledge of ecclesiastical history and antiquities; but still more in the talent and decision with which he exercised, in so many years, and in such critical times, the high functions with which he was invested.

In the employment of his wealth he was not only charitable but munificent; especially to distressed and persecuted ministers from abroad, whom Beza and others commended to his kindness. Nay, it

is reported that he frequently remitted large sums to Beza himself.

In his temper, he was irascible,—an infirmity, alas ! that is seldom found disunited from ardent zeal. This disposition, however, it is said, he partially subdued ; so far, indeed, that the ‘judicious Hooker’ scruples not to say, “that he always governed with that moderation which useth, by patience, to suppress boldness.” Nevertheless, there were incontrovertibly seasons in which he governed, but without moderation, and displayed far more boldness than patience. He published nothing but what the controversy with Cartwright provoked. In Strype’s life, however, will be found a curious collection of his papers, declarations, letters, &c., which form both a valuable commentary on his own character, and one strikingly illustrative of the times in which he lived.

Richard Hooker.

BORN A. D. 1553.—DIED A. D. 1600.

This celebrated divine was born at Heavitree, near Exeter, about the year 1553. His parents were respectable in character, and of middling circumstances, but neglected not the education of their son. He was placed at the grammar school of Exeter, and, by his early genius, modesty, and inquisitive mind, won the affections of his tutor. This worthy man interested himself exceedingly for young Hooker ; and, by his earnest persuasion, the youth was continued at school to wait for some opening whereby he might proceed to college. Being now destined for the church, his parents and tutor redoubled their diligence to instil into his mind the principles of piety and virtue ; and the tutor did his part toward the advancement of his pupil in the paths of learning.

Young Hooker had an uncle, possessed of wealth, and residing in the city of Exeter, chamberlain of the city, and representing it in parliament ; learned also in antiquities, and able to appreciate the value of education. To this gentleman the tutor applied, on behalf of his pupil, to prevail with him to become his patron, and send him to college. The uncle assenting, Richard was introduced by him to Bishop Jewel, whom he “besought, for charity’s sake, to look favourably upon a poor nephew of his, whom nature had fitted for a scholar, but the estate of his parents was so narrow, that they were unable to give him the advantage of learning, and that the bishop would, therefore, become his patron, and prevent him from being a tradesman, for that he was a boy of remarkable hopes.”

Being now in his fourteenth year, Richard was directed, by the bishop, to remove to Oxford, and there to attend Dr Cole, then president of Corpus Christi college, who appointed him a tutor, and made him Bible-clerk of the college. Here he continued under the instruction of Dr John Reynolds until he was eighteen ; and his patron, the bishop, took care to recommend him so strongly to Sandys, archbishop of York, that he had the bishop’s son for a pupil at Oxford. About this period, he had a dangerous illness, which lasted two months. On his

recovery, he took a journey on foot, with a college friend, to see his mother, who had been extremely anxious for his recovery. On his way, he called on his patron, the bishop, at Salisbury, who treated him with great friendship, enjoining him to return to him on his way back. In the meantime, however, the bishop died, and Hooker became dejected at the loss of his patron. His friend, Dr Cole, however, promised him his assistance, and, in a short time, he was chosen to be one of the twenty scholars of the foundation, being a native of Devonshire. Having taken his degree of master of arts, in 1577, he was chosen fellow of the college. At this time Hooker contracted an intimacy with several learned men, whose names are well known to the world, among whom were Sir Henry Savil, Dr J. Reynolds, and Dr Spence. His two distinguished pupils, Sir Edwyn Sandys and George Cranmer, nephew to the archbishop, entertained for him the highest regard, and became his intimate friends.

Thus pursuing his studies till about 1581, he then entered into orders, and was, according to the college statutes, immediately appointed to preach a sermon at St Paul's Cross, London. On arrival in town, after a fatiguing and uncomfortable journey on horseback, he was lodged at a dwelling appropriated for the preachers, called the Shunamite's house. This was kept by a person of the name of Churchman, whose wife, pitying Mr Hooker's sad plight, nursed him very assiduously, thereby enabling him to go through the duty for which he came. The worthy preacher felt his hostess's kindness so gratefully, that he was easily persuaded to promise her that he would enter into the matrimonial estate, and commit to her care the business of choosing him a wife. Mrs Churchman soon fulfilled her commission, by proposing her own daughter, who soon after became Mrs Hooker. Having thus lost his fellowship, and, according to report, made a most unequal match, he was presented, in 1584, to the rectory of Drayton-Beauchamp, in Buckinghamshire, where, having continued about a year, his two pupils, Edwyn Sandys and George Cranmer, on their return from their travels paid him a visit. They found him tending a few sheep on the common, with the odes of Horace in his hand, and learned that they must stay with him there till the servant's return. They had scarcely entered the parsonage when Mrs Hooker sent for her husband to rock the cradle; and the visitors, finding their presence unwelcome to the lady, took their departure hastily, much lamenting their beloved tutor's condition, to which, however, he was piously resigned, as appears by his reply to George Cranmer's condolence,—“My dear George, if saints have usually a double share in the miseries of this life, I that am none ought not to repine at what my wise Creator hath appointed for me, but labour, as indeed I do daily, to submit to his will, and possess my soul in patience and peace.”

On their return to London, Edwin Sandys earnestly solicited his father, then bishop of London, to provide for Hooker's more comfortable maintenance. An opportunity soon occurred by the death of Mr Alvy, master of the temple, who, for his learning and consistent deportment, had acquired the appellation of Father Alvy. The archbishop so strongly recommended Mr Hooker to succeed their late friend, that the benchers offered him the appointment, which, though pressed by the bishop, he was most reluctant to accept, preferring a more private and quiet station. His aversion, however, being overcome by the bishop's persua-

sions, he was, by patent, made master of the temple for life, being then in the 34th year of his age. The publicity of this situation was not suitable to the habits of Hooker, nor was he able to enjoy that personal quietness which he desired. Being the morning lecturer at the temple, in the room of Mr Alvy, the afternoon preacher was Mr Travers, who followed the opinions of Cartwright the puritan, and leaned to the presbyterian side in discipline. This contrariety of sentiment led to an amicable controversy between the lecturers, who seem to have entertained for each other all due respect. Thus, it was observed, "the forenoon sermon spoke Canterbury, and the afternoon Geneva."

This pulpit warfare having continued sometime, and the benchers being as divided as their preachers, Travers's sentiments beginning to prevail in the temple, the archbishop, Whitgift, put a stop to Mr Travers's preaching, by a positive prohibition. Travers appealed in vain to the queen, though powerfully supported in the council by the earl of Leicester and others. The archbishop, her 'little black husband,' as she termed him, effectually excluded him, and thus decided the controversy in the temple. But Mr Travers having published his memorial addressed to the queen, and his cause being taken up by persons of great consideration, Hooker was called upon, also, to appear in print with his answer, which he dedicated to the archbishop. Mr Travers accused Hooker of maintaining several doctrinal errors, particularly this, that men might be saved although they mingled their own merits with those of Christ,—supposing, for example, a pope or cardinal to renounce all error, this one opinion of merit excepted, that we ought not to conclude them without hope.

The removal of Mr Travers from the temple, in this way, gave much offence to many of the benchers, who were not careful to transfer to Mr Hooker the respect which they had manifested to their late minister. Hooker, however, thought to win them, by composing a regular treatise on church polity, to be comprised in eight books, justifying to the utmost the established order of the church of England. This work was to defend the doctrine of the church's power to make canons for the use of ceremonies, and, by law, to impose an obedience to them as upon her children. Having commenced the work in the temple, he found too much distraction in that situation, and, therefore, solicited the archbishop to remove him to the country. In his address he says,—“I am weary of the noise and oppositions of this place : indeed God and nature did not intend me for contentions, but for study and quietness ; and, my lord, my particular contests here with Mr Travers have proved the more unpleasant to me because I believe him to be a good man, and that belief hath occasioned me to examine mine own conscience concerning his opinions ; and to satisfy that, I have consulted the holy Scripture, and other laws, both human and divine, whether the conscience of him, and others of his judgment, ought to be so far complied with by us as to alter our frame of church government, our manner of God's worship, our praising and praying to him, and our established ceremonies, as often as their tender consciences shall require us ; and, in this examination, I have not only satisfied myself, but have begun a treatise, in which I intend the satisfaction of others, by a demonstration of the reasonableness of our laws of ecclesiastical polity, and therein laid a hopeful foundation for the church's peace ; and so as not to provoke

your adversary, Mr Cartwright, nor Mr Travers, whom I take to be mine—but not mine enemy—God knows this to be my meaning. To which end I have searched many books, and spent many thoughtful hours, and I hope not in vain, for I write to reasonable men. But, my lord, I shall never be able to finish what I have begun unless I be removed into some quiet country parsonage, where I may see God's blessings spring out of my mother earth, and eat mine own bread in peace and privacy,—a place where I may, without disturbance, meditate my approaching mortality, and that great account which all flesh must, at the last great day, give to the God of all spirits. This is my design; and, as these are the desires of my heart, so they shall, by God's assistance, be the constant endeavours of the uncertain remainder of my life; and, therefore, if your Grace can think me and my poor labours worthy of such a favour, let me beg it, that I may perfect what I have begun, which is a blessing I cannot hope for in this place."

Mr Hooker, therefore, in 1591, was presented to the rectory of Boscum, near Salisbury, and, in the same year, was instituted a minor prebendary of the cathedral. Here he continued till he had finished four of his eight proposed books on ecclesiastical polity, which he printed and published in 1594, being then in the 39th year of his age. In 1595 he surrendered the living of Boscum, and was presented by the queen with that of Bishop's Borne, three miles from Canterbury. Here he proceeded with his treatise, and, having completed the fifth book, he published it separately in 1597, and dedicated it to his patron, the archbishop. The fame of this work having reached Rome, and being approved of by the most learned of the papists, Cardinal Allen and Dr Stapleton recommended it so strongly to Clement the VIII., that he desired to have it translated into Latin, declaring that "his works would get reverence by age, for that there were such seeds of eternity in them as would make them continue till the last fire shall consume all learning." This work was also highly esteemed by James the First, who said to Archbishop Whitgift,—“I have received more satisfaction in reading a leaf or paragraph in Mr Hooker, though it were but about the fashion of churches, or church music, or the like, but especially of the sacraments, than I have had in reading large treatises written but of one of those subjects by others, though very learned men.” Charles the First, also, had so high a regard for this work that he enjoined his son to be “studious in Mr Hooker's books.” At Bishop's Borne he divided his time between study and devotion and the discharge of his pastoral duties, and proceeded to the completion of the remaining three books of the church polity.

While in this retirement he contracted a close intimacy with Dr Saravia, an opponent of Beza on the subject of church polity. This friendship was particularly cheering to Hooker under his last illness, which was thought to be aggravated by his close application to study, in order to finish his book. This being accomplished, his appetite failed, and he was confined to his bed. The day preceding his death, his friend, Dr Saravia, confessed him, gave him absolution, and administered the sacrament to him. The next morning, on visiting him, the Doctor found him in meditation, and, on inquiring the subject, he replied that he was meditating the number and nature of angels, and their blessed obedience and order, without which peace could not be in hea-

ven ; and, oh, that it might be so on earth ! adding these words :—" I have lived to see this world is made up of perturbations, and I have been long preparing to leave it, and gathering comfort for the dreadful hour of making my account with God, which I now apprehend to be near ; and though I have, by his grace, loved him in my youth, and feared him in mine age, and laboured to have a conscience void of offence to him, and to all men, yet if thou, O Lord, be extreme to mark what I have done amiss, who can abide it ? and, therefore, where I have failed, Lord, show mercy to me ; for I plead not my righteousness, but the forgiveness of my unrighteousness for his merits who died to purchase a pardon for penitent sinners ; and since I owe thee a death, Lord, let it not be terrible, and then take thine own time. I submit to it. Let not mine, O Lord, but thly will be done." Then falling into slumber, on his awaking he said,—“ Good Doctor, God hath heard my daily petitions, for I am at peace with all men, and he is at peace with me ; and from which blessed assurance I feel that inward joy which this world can neither give nor take from me.” Soon after uttering these words, he expired, in the 46th year of his age, and A. D. 1600.

Dean Powell.

BORN A. D. 1507.—DIED A. D. 1601.

THE name of Alexander Nowell, during a period of seventy years, was intimately connected with the civil and ecclesiastical history of his country. He was the son of John Nowell, of Read, in the county of Lancaster, and was born in 1507 or 1508. He was educated at Middleton, and became a member of Brazen-nose college, Oxford, at the early age of thirteen. In his twentieth year, he was a public reader of logic in that university. In 1543, he was appointed second master on the new foundation of Westminster school, in which important station he is said to have instilled the principles of the Reformation into the minds of his pupils, while reading with them the New Testament in the original language. The successor of Nowell in the mastership of Westminster, was Nicholas Udall, famous, like Busby, ‘for erudition and for flogging.’

In the first parliament of Mary, Nowell was returned for Loo, in Cornwall, but was not permitted to take his seat, on the ground of his being a prebendary of Westminster, and merely having a voice in the convocation. The decision was by no means a correct one, for none below the dignity of dean or archdean were bound to personal appearance in the convocation ; but Nowell found it expedient to submit to it, and soon afterwards to remove altogether from the kingdom, and join his exiled countrymen in Germany. In their society he distinguished himself by his endeavours to preserve and promote the general harmony, which was threatened with interruption by the unfortunate disputes which occurred amongst them, on the subject of church government. On the accession of Elizabeth, Nowell returned to England, and was made one of the commissioners for the visitation of the kingdom. His brother, Laurence, was appointed dean of Lichfield ; himself, rector of Saltwood, prebendary of Canterbury, prebendary of

Westminster, and, finally, dean of St Paul's. In 1562, Nowell was chosen prolocutor of the lower house of convocation, when the articles of religion were revised and subscribed; and, on this occasion, he proposed that some other long garment should be used instead of the surplice; that the sign of the cross should be omitted in baptism; that kneeling at the communion should be left to the discretion of the ordinary, and that saints' days should be abrogated; but he was overruled in these judicious propositions, by the voice of the majority. The principal production of Nowell's pen, is his 'Catechism,' which was first published in June, 1570, in Latin. Shortly afterwards, a Latin abridgment of it appeared, and both were immediately translated into English, by Thomas Norton. They are still standard books.

Nowell died on the 13th of February, 1601. His character has been thus ably summed up by his latest and best biographer, Mr Churton:—"Nowell was one of those holy builders, who, in repairing the breaches of our Sion, did not use 'untempered mortar.' Endowed with excellent parts, he was soon distinguished by the progress he made in the schools of Oxford, where he devoted thirteen years, the flower of his youth, and the best time for improvement, to the cultivation of classical elegance and useful knowledge. His capacity for teaching, tried first in the shade of the university, became more conspicuous when he was placed at the head of the first seminary in the metropolis; and, at the same time, his talents as a preacher were witnessed and approved by some of the principal auditories of the realm. Attainments such as these, and a life that adorned them, rendered him a fit object for Bonner's hatred; but Providence rescued him from the fangs of the tiger, in the very act of springing upon his prey.

‘Habuerunt virtutes spatium exemplorum.’

Retirement, suffering, and study, in the company of Jewell, Grindal, and Sandys, stimulated by the conversation and example of Peter Martyr, and other famed divines of Germany, returned him to his native land, with reunited vigour and increasing lustre, when the days of tyranny were overpast.

Elizabeth, and her sage counsellor, Burleigh, placed him at once in an eminent situation among those of secondary rank in the church, and accumulated other preferments upon him, and would probably have advanced him to the episcopal bench, had not his real modesty, together with the consciousness of approaching old age, been known to have created in him a fixed determination not to be raised to a station of greater dignity; which, however, all things considered, could scarcely, in his case, have been a sphere of greater usefulness. Near to his friend and patron, Bishop Grindal, near also to his other illustrious friend and patron, the excellently pious and prudent Archbishop Parker, and not distant from the court, he was an able coadjutor to each and to all, in bringing forward and perfecting what they all had at heart,—the restoration of true and pure religion. It is indeed impossible to view him, in the department assigned him, without love and admiration. Meek, retired, and unobtrusive, he is ready at every call of duty; he is solicited from all quarters, and on all occasions. If a sermon, on some great emergency, is to be preached at the cross, at court, or before parliament,—Nowell is the preacher. If the relentless hand of death

has deprived the nation of one of its brightest ornaments, of either sex, an Ascham, a Sidney, or a Cecil,—he is requested to console the surviving relatives in a funeral discourse, and to convert the common example into benefit. When the beautiful and lofty spire of St Paul's, by a stroke from heaven, is laid in ashes, the dean is the person who successfully exhorts the generous citizens to a speedy reparation of the sacred edifice. When the proud armada has been defeated,—he is selected to announce in the house of God the unparalleled victory, and to prepare the public mind for public thanks. If donations are solicited for the university in which he was not educated, at the hands of those who are ever ready to give,—the opulent merchants and inhabitants of the metropolis,—their thoughts are immediately fixed upon Mr Nowell, and he is desired to be treasurer of the bounty. When contributions are requested for distressed protestants abroad, those of first rank and influence in the nation, wishing to forward the object of the petition, particularly desire the aid and advice of Nowell."

Thomas Cartwright.

BORN A. D. 1535.—DIED A. D. 1603.

THIS distinguished puritan divine was born in the county of Hertford, about the year 1535. At the age of fifteen, he entered St John's college, Cambridge. Here he pursued his studies so closely as never to allow himself more than five hours for repose—a rule to which he adhered through life. On the death of Edward VI. and the general conformity of the clergy to the popish ritual, he found it expedient to withdraw from college, and to engage himself as assistant to a barrister. On the accession of Elizabeth, when the clergy reverted back to protestantism, Cartwright was inducted into his college again. The bent of his mind was toward the study of theology; but he neglected no branch of useful knowledge, and he was distinguished for his acuteness in logic. In 1560, he became fellow of his college, which he quitted in 1563, for another fellowship in Trinity college, where he was soon appointed one of the *soeci majores*.

In 1564, her majesty was magnificently entertained at the university, on which occasion a philosophy-act was held, and Cartwright engaged in it as first opponent. In 1567 he commenced bachelor of divinity, and in 1569 was made Margaret professor of divinity. His professorship implied his qualification for the degree of doctor of divinity, and accordingly he put in his claim for a diploma at the ensuing commencement; but the symptoms of puritanism were too apparent to allow of his obtaining this honour. His popularity, however, suffered no abatement from this opposition; and his lectures on the Acts of the Apostles at St Mary's, drew crowds of admiring auditors. Cartwright was no advocate for ceremonies; and such was the effect of his sermon at the chapel of his college, on one occasion, that all the students, except three, appeared at evening-prayer without the surplice, against which he had been inveighing.

Mr Cartwright proceeding in the work of reformation faster than was agreeable to the queen and the bishops, Grindal, archbishop of York,

addressed a letter, June 24th, 1570, to the chancellor of the university, Sir William Cecil, then secretary of state, wherein he pressed that some course might be taken with Mr Cartwright. He represented, that his lectures were directed against the external polity and officers of the church, and that, consequently, the students who were very "toward in learning," attended in great numbers, and were in danger of being "poisoned by him with love of contention and liking of novelty." He accordingly solicited the chancellor to procure Cartwright and his adherents to be silenced, "both in schools and pulpits," and if they could not be reduced to conformity, to expel them from their colleges or the university, as the case should require. He also urged upon the chancellor, that Cartwright might not be allowed to take his degree or proceed doctor in divinity for which he had made application. Cartwright immediately appealed in an elegant Latin letter to the chancellor, affirming that he was averse to every thing seditious or contentious; that he had not taught any doctrine which his texts did not justify; and that he had cautiously avoided treating of the habits, even when an occasion offered itself: but he admitted having taught that the ministry of the church had declined from that of the ancient and apostolic church, and that he wished it should be framed on a purer model. Even these sentiments, he said, he had delivered "sedately, and in a way which none but some ignorant or malignant hearers could find fault with."

This reply was favourably received by the chancellor, who, however, forbade him "to read upon those nice questions." Cartwright soon after presented to Dr May, the vice-chancellor, a paper containing several propositions relative to ecclesiastical reform, of which the following are the heads. "1. The names and functions of archbishops and archdeacons ought to be abolished. 2. The offices of the lawful ministers of the church, as bishops and deacons, ought to be reduced to the Scriptural and apostolical institution;—the bishops to preach the word of God and pray, and deacons to have charge of the poor. 3. The government of the church ought not to be intrusted to bishops, chancellors, or to officials of archdeacons; but every church ought to be governed by its own minister and presbytery. 4. Ministers ought not to be at large, but should have each charge of one particular flock. 5. No person ought to solicit or stand as a candidate for the ministry. 6. Ministers ought not to be made and appointed by the sole authority of bishops; much less in a study or other private place; but the election ought to be made by the church. These reformatiions being effected, every one should labour in his calling: the magistrate should act by his authority,—the ministry by the word,—and all by their prayers."

These propositions the vice-chancellor May admonished him to revoke, and, on his refusal, punished him by "the subtraction of his stipend," and so he continued in his lecture that year; but the next year Dr Whitgift, being vice-chancellor and armed with authority, summoned Cartwright before him, requiring "his absolute answer, whether he did mind to teach his auditor's otherwise, revoking what he had before taught, or would abide in the maintenance of the same?"

Cartwright, in reply, avowed boldly that "the propositions were what he had openly taught, and still continued determined to maintain and defend." On receiving this decided answer, Whitgift proceeded to

pronounce sentence of deposition on him, whereby he was removed from his professorship and prohibited from preaching within the university and its jurisdiction. The propositions said to be dangerous and seditious, gathered from his lectures and private conversations, were sent to court by Whitgift to 'incense' the queen and chancellor against Cartwright. One of the charges against him was that he was guilty of perjury. This, however, vanishes into a mere pretext when it is found that the accusation relates to Cartwright's remaining only in deacon's orders when the statutes of the college required that he should proceed to priest's orders: yet long afterwards, Whitgift insisted that he had expelled Cartwright for perjury.

On his expulsion from the university, Cartwright was received into the houses of his private friends and supported by them, at the same time employing his time carefully as a tutor to their children. At length he found it prudent to withdraw to the continent, where he formed an acquaintance with Beza and other eminent scholars and divines. He was ultimately induced to accept the office of minister of the English merchants at Antwerp, and afterwards removed to Middleburgh, where he remained about three years. After an absence of about five years, he returned to England.

Controversies on the subject of reformation then running high, Cartwright soon took a leading part in them against his old opponent, Whitgift, who had answered 'the Admonition to the Parliament,' for which work the principal authors, Field and Wilcocks, were suffering rigorous imprisonment in Newgate. To this answer, Cartwright replied in a quarto volume, and gained great credit for the performance, his enemies themselves being among those who expressed encomiums on the ability he displayed. But for that very cause it was deemed the more important to get the work suppressed and its author chastised. To this end, December 11th, 1573, a warrant was issued from the high commission court for the apprehension of Mr Cartwright, who notwithstanding, escaped their hands and fled to Heidelberg. We have already noticed the progress of this controversy in our account of Cartwright's archiepiscopal opponent.

While on the continent, Cartwright became once more the minister of the English factory at Antwerp. After passing some years there, disease had so encroached on his constitution, that his physicians thought he had no other chance of prolonging his life than by returning to England. He ventured to solicit of the lords of the council, —through the earl of Leicester and the lord-treasurer Burleigh,—permission to return to his native country without being liable to molestation. Leicester had made respectful and honourable mention of him in parliament the preceding session, and now both he and Cecil represented his condition to the queen, but were unable to assure Cartwright of her protection. He resolved, nevertheless, to return in the year 1584-5, but he had scarcely landed, when he was apprehended and imprisoned on the authority of Aylmer, then bishop of London; but the government evinced its disapprobation of so harsh a measure. In this dilemma, the bishop resolved to indict him in the name of the queen. Her majesty then became offended, and Aylmer was obliged to write to the lord-treasurer to intercede on his behalf in the following terms:—
"I understand myself to be in some displeasure with her Majesty about

Mr Cartwright, because I sent word to your lordships by the clerk of the council that I committed him by her majesty's commandment. Alas ! my lord, in what a dilemma stood I, that, if I had not showed that warrant, I should have had all your displeasures, which I was not able to bear : and using it for my shield (being not forbidden by her majesty) I am blamed for not taking upon me a matter wherein she herself would not be seen. Well, I leave it to God and to your wisdom to consider in what a dangerous place of service I am ! But God, whom I serve, and in whose hands the hearts of princes are, as the rivers of waters, can and will turn all to the best, and stir up such honourable friends as you are, to appease her highness's indignation." Cartwright thus shielded from the violence of his episcopal adversaries, enjoyed some needful repose, which was not, however, unproductive ; nor, in truth, was it possible that the learning and abilities of such a man could be effectually obscured. Indeed, so much were they held in esteem, really by his adversaries, and avowedly by the most learned among the reformed, that, on the one hand, Cartwright's works were committed to the hands of the celebrated Richard Hooker and his assistants, to be answered by the work on ecclesiastical polity ; and, on the other hand, Cartwright was pointed out by Beza as the fittest person in England to defend the protestant cause against the perversions of the papists in the Rhemish translation of the New Testament. This work, therefore, to the honour of Cartwright, and the successful defence of truth, was placed, by authority of the council, in Cartwright's hands ; and the sum of one hundred pounds was transmitted by the lord-treasurer toward the expense of books and other needful assistance in the work. This important duty, however, was not in agreement with the will of Archbishop Whitgift, who, on learning that Cartwright was thus employed, immediately prohibited him from proceeding. This mandate he found it necessary at first to comply with, but afterwards he made considerable progress in the work, to the great satisfaction of the learned among the reformed.

Mr Cartwright was now become a family man, with a wife and several daughters. He married the sister of Mr John Stubbs, student of Lincoln's Inn, who suffered the amputation of his right hand for the offence of publishing a book against the queen's projected marriage. His patrimonial estate at Waddon, in Cambridgeshire, he had been obliged to sell, and his wife obtained some profit from the business of malt-making : but Cartwright had not chosen the path to ecclesiastical preferment. He was, however, after a period of domestic difficulty from the persecution of his enemies, and increasing bodily infirmities, taken under the patronage of the earl of Leicester, and by him appointed about the year 1586, to be master of the hospital which the earl had founded at Warwick. To this office was attached a stipend of one hundred pounds per annum, which was much lessened after the earl's death in 1588. To this patron, and to his brother, the earl of Warwick, Cartwright was indebted for much protection and countenance ; and the earl of Leicester offered him the provost-ship of Eton college, which he declined. Warwick, therefore, became his home, though he had long intervals of absence, through the arbitrary proceedings of his enemies.

In November 1590, he was summoned up from Warwick to appear

before the star-chamber. With Edmund Snape and other puritan ministers, he was indicted "for setting up a new discipline and a new form of worship, and subscribing their hands to it." The whole were committed to the Fleet prison, and there they remained through the winter. In the spring, Cartwright pleading his age and infirmities, "feeling," as he says, "the gout and stone both to grow fast upon me, I applied to Lord Burleigh for relief, but without success." In May 1591, Cartwright was sent for by the bishop to appear before him and Dr Bancroft, and some others of the ecclesiastical commission. On this occasion, there was a long discussion on the subject of the *ex officio* oath, which the court required him to take, and which he refused, as requiring him to swear indefinitely that he would answer any and every thing demanded of him. On his refusal he was remanded to prison, where he and his fellow prisoners for conscience sake remained two years without any further process, or being admitted to bail. The king of Scotland, who had so high an opinion of Cartwright, that, in 1580, he invited him to accept a professorship in the university of St Andrews, applied to Elizabeth in vain on behalf of Mr Cartwright and his brethren: there was no relenting.

After various applications for release on bail, the sufferers were induced to unite in a petition to the fountain-head of ecclesiastical power—the archbishop Whitgift. To this petition he replied, that if they would renounce their sentiments and their assemblies as unlawful and seditious, they might expect his compliance. Turning with despair from this insult, they resolved to petition the queen. What reception this petition met with is not shown, nor when the petitioners obtained their release; but it is understood not to have been soon. However, at length, on a promise to be quiet, the archbishop consented that they should be discharged—though on this condition that, in default of their amendment, they should appear again upon twenty days warning being given.

In 1592, soon after Cartwright's release, Dr Cosin, dean of the arches, and official principal to Archbishop Whitgift, wrote a book against Hacket, Coppinger, and Arthington, the design of which was to bring odium on the puritans for the wild fanaticism of those persons; and especially to represent Cartwright as privy to designs of sedition and treason. Happily for him, there was no shadow of a proof for this vile insinuation. On his return to Warwick, Mr Cartwright resumed his pastoral and other ministerial duties with great earnestness, so as to draw down upon him further dislike from the ecclesiastical powers. At length, being silenced by the bishops, he was requested by the Lord Zouch, governor of Guernsey, to go with him to that island, where he continued at least till 1596.

Attempts have been made to show that, after all, Cartwright repented of his puritan principles in his old age, and that he confessed himself guilty of the sin of schism: of this there is no probable proof. His age and infirmities naturally withdrew him from the scene of polemical strife, and disposed him to prepare more assiduously for his departure hence. It is said, that at the close of life he possessed wealth—the reward of his privations and sufferings. We may admit the truth of such statement without allowing the imputation of guilt: whatever he possessed, he was not avaricious, for we are told that it was his

custom "on the Sabbath to distribute money to the poor of the town of Warwick, beside what he gave to the prisoners."

He continued his assiduity in his studies even in old age. He usually rose at two, three, and at the latest four o'clock in the morning, summer and winter, notwithstanding that his infirmities compelled him to study continually on his knees. Nor would he intermit his ministerial labours, but persisted to preach, when many times he could scarcely creep into the pulpit. He died on the 27th of December, 1693, aged sixty-eight. To conclude in the words of Fuller concerning this distinguished man:—"His life may be presumed most pious; it concerning him to be strict in his conversation, who so stickled for the reformation of all abuses in the church. An excellent scholar; pure Latinist; his travels advantaging the ready use thereof; accurate Grecian; exact Hebrician, as his comments on the Proverbs and other works do sufficiently testify."

Beside those already mentioned, Cartwright wrote several works which were published after his death: viz. '*Metaphrasis et Homiliæ in librum Solomonis qui inscribitur Ecclesiastes*,' 1604, 4to. '*Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians*,' 1612, 4to. '*A Body of Divinity*,' 1616, 4to. '*Commentaria Practica in totam Historiam Evangelicam, ex quatuor Evangelistis harmonicè concinnatam*,' 1630, 4to. Et idem, sub. tit. '*Harmonia Evangelica Commentario*,' &c. 1647. '*Commentarii succincti et dilucidi in Proverbia Salomonis*,' 1638, 4to. '*Directorium of Church Government*,' 1644, 4to. *

III.—LITERARY SERIES.

William Grocyn.

BORN A. D. 1442.—DIED A. D. 1519.

WILLIAM GROCYN, one of the earliest restorers of learning in England, was born at Bristol in 1442, and educated in the grammar school of Winchester. He was elected thence to New college, Oxford, in 1467, and, in 1479, was presented by the warden and fellows to one of their rectories in Buckinghamshire. He still continued to reside at Oxford, however, and was appointed divinity reader by the society of Magdalene college, in which capacity he was honoured to hold a public disputation before Richard III., on the occasion of that prince visiting Oxford. In 1485 he was presented to a prebendal stall in Lincoln cathedral; and, three years afterwards, he set out on foreign travel, animated, it would seem, by the desire of acquiring knowledge, and especially desirous of perfecting himself in the Greek language, in which, though regarded as one of the best Greek and Latin scholars in England, he felt and regretted his deficiency. He was now forty-six years of age, yet he went in quest of learning with all the readiness and

* See *Memoirs of Cartwright*, prefixed to Hanbury's edition of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, 3 vols, 8vo, 1830.

buoyancy of youth, and, in company with several of his countrymen, became the pupil of Angelo Politian, the most elegant Latinist of his day, and of Demetrius Chalcondylas, one of those learned men who had fled from Constantinople when it was taken by the Turks. To the prelections of these two excellent instructors he devoted two years, and then returned to Oxford, where he commenced teaching the Greek language, and was the first who introduced the new pronunciation of it. While he was thus engaged, the celebrated Erasmus visited Oxford, and became one of Grocyn's pupils. The foreign scholar was in straitened circumstances, but the professor, though not rich himself, kindly took him into his house, and supplied his wants from his own limited means. Erasmus was not ungrateful, and took every opportunity which subsequently offered itself of extolling the learning and hospitality of his friend. Grocyn's favourite classic was Aristotle; and he had formed a design, in conjunction with his friends, Latimer and Linacre, of translating the whole works of that philosopher, but they did not pursue it. When Colet, dean of St Paul's, introduced the practice of prelecting on a portion of the Scriptures in his cathedral, he engaged Grocyn to perform that duty, as the fittest for the task in England. While thus engaged, Grocyn commenced a series of lectures on the book of Dionysius, called '*Hierarchia Ecclesiastica*,' and took occasion to preface his course, by declaiming, with great warmth, against all those who denied or doubted the authority of that work; but, after he had continued to read a few weeks he began to doubt the authenticity of that work himself, and, having finally convinced himself that it was spurious, he openly and frankly confessed that he had been in error, and recalled his former opinion. He died at Maidstone, in 1519, of a paralytic affection, which had made him outlive his faculties. A Latin epistle of his to Aldus Manutius is prefixed to Linacre's translation of '*Proclus de Sphæra*.' Bale, Leland, and Tanner mention some other pieces of his, but they are few. Erasmus says he was of so refined a taste, that he never could satisfy himself with any thing which he wrote, and was not easily persuaded to handle his pen.

John Colet.

BORN A. D. 1466.—DIED A. D. 1519.

THIS learned English divine was the first born of the eleven sons and eleven daughters of Sir Henry Colet, mayor of London. He was born in 1466, and received the rudiments of education in London. In 1483 he was entered of Magdalene college, Oxford, and spent seven years at the university, chiefly in the study of logic and philosophy. Greek was not cultivated at Oxford while Colet resided there, and the proverb, '*Cave à Græcis, ne fias hæreticus*,' was still current at that seat of learning, for Linacre, Grocyn, Erasmus, and their associates had not yet broken ground against the Trojans, as the opponents of Greek learning quaintly called themselves; but Colet continued to make himself acquainted with some of the Greek writers, by means of a Latin translation, and subsequently obtained such instruction, during four years of foreign travel, as enabled him to master the originals themselves. Colet

appears to have remained on the continent from 1493 to 1497. In Paris he became acquainted with Budæus, Erasmus, Politian, and several of the leading scholars of the age, in whose society he perfected his acquaintance with the classics, and improved himself greatly in the belles lettres of the age. On his return to England, he spent some time at court, and narrowly escaped giving himself up to the attractions and dissipations of fashionable life; for, to the qualifications of a scholar, he added the habits and accomplishments of a gentleman, and his natural disposition was by no means favourable to the life of a recluse and a scholar. At last he tore himself from the gaieties of the capital, and, retiring to Oxford, betook himself to a life of close study and application.

While in Italy, he had applied himself to the study of theology, and had carefully perused the New Testament in the original; he had also made himself acquainted with the writings of the fathers, particularly those of Origen, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Jerome; he was, therefore, well qualified, according to the measure of the times, for prelecting on the Scriptures, and, having made choice of Paul's epistles for that purpose, he gave a course of public readings on them, which excited great attention, and drew crowds of scholars to Oxford. He continued these lectures three years, and in 1501 was admitted to proceed in divinity, or to the reading of the 'Sentences.' In 1504 he was created D.D., and, in May 1505, was instituted to the prebend of Mora, in St Paul's, London, and, immediately afterwards, appointed dean of that church. Of this last office he discharged the duties with exemplary zeal, by introducing a more strict and regular discipline, by preaching in the cathedral every Sunday, and by procuring some of his learned friends to read weekly lectures on divinity. These lectures roused a spirit of inquiry after the Scriptures, and tended greatly to prepare men's minds for the reformation which was soon to follow. The dean himself censured the ignorance and vices of his brother-clergy with great boldness of speech, and might have suffered for his honesty had he not been protected by Archbishop Warham. The bitterness which his enemies manifested towards him, however, had the effect of inducing him to resolve on retiring from public life at an earlier age than called for such a step. With this view he had built a house for himself near Richmond palace, in Surrey. But having been twice attacked by the sweating sickness, and relapsing a third time, a consumption ensued, which terminated his life on the 16th of September, 1519.

Several of Colet's writings are printed amongst the epistles of Erasmus, and at the end of Knight's life of him. He was the author of the 'Rudimenta Grammatices,' commonly called 'Paul's Accidence,' which was first published in 1539, in octavo; also of a work entitled 'Absolutissimus de octu Orationis Partium constructione Libellus,' which formed the basis of Lilly's grammar, published at Antwerp in 1530. His preaching was plain and popular; and he had imbibed some of the opinions which ultimately led to the reformation of religion in England. Erasmus, in an epistle to Jodocus Jonas, has described with some minuteness the habits and qualities of his friend Colet.

William Lily.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1468.—DIED A. D. 1523.

THIS eminent English grammarian was born at Odiham, in Hampshire, about the year 1468. He was educated at Oxford, where he took the degree of B. A. Soon after leaving the university, he appears to have made a journey to Jerusalem, but whether he was influenced by religious motives in this undertaking or not, is now matter only of conjecture. Pits, Wood, and Tanner, say he was; but their predecessor, and only authority on the point, Bale, gives no intimation of such motives having existed on Lily's part. It is indeed most probable that, catching the dawning spirit of the times, our scholar took his journey to the east for the purpose of acquiring some knowledge of the Greek language, the beauties of which were just beginning to make themselves known to western scholars. And this conjecture receives additional support from the fact, that he remained five years stationary in the island of Rhodes, where he enjoyed the company of many learned Greek refugees, who, after the taking of Constantinople, had found shelter here, under the gallant and hospitable protection of the knights of St John.

From Rhodes, Lily went to Rome, where he enjoyed the instructions of Joannes Sulpitius and Pomponius Sabinus, two of the most accomplished scholars of their day. He returned to England in 1509, soon after which date he appears to have settled in London, and opened a private grammar-school in that city. His success and reputation soon gained for him the mastership of Dean Colet's school. In this laborious, but useful and honourable employment, he spent the remainder of his life, until cut off by the plague, in 1523. We have the authority of Erasmus for regarding Lily as not only one of the best scholars, but one of the most skilful pedagogues of his day. Many of his scholars attained to high eminence in public life, and still more were distinguished for their superior literary attainments.

He had a principal hand in the compilation of the '*Brevissima institutio, seu Ratio grammaticæ cognoscendæ*,' first published in London, in 1513, and still used under the name of '*Lily's Grammar*.' In conjunction with his accomplished friend, Sir Thomas More, he translated several Greek epigrams, which were published at Basil, in 1518, under the title of '*Progymnasmata Thomæ Mori et Gulielmi Liliæ, sodalium*.' Among his other pieces, are, '*Pœmata varia*,' sundry '*Apologia*;' and a treatise, '*De laudibus Dei-pari Virginis*.' Lily's two sons, George and Peter, were both good scholars, and obtained ecclesiastical preferments; but neither of them enjoyed his father's reputation.

Thomas Linacre, M. D.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1460.—DIED A. D. 1524.

THIS learned physician was born about the year 1460, at Canterbury. His education was begun at the King's school in that city,

where his teacher was William Sellings, a man of great learning. He went very soon to Oxford, where he was elected fellow of All Souls college. His former master, Sellings, being sent on an embassy to the court of Rome by Henry VII., Linaere accompanied him for the sake of further improvement. He remained for some time at Florence, where he had the good fortune to be patronized by the celebrated Lorenzo de Medici, at that time one of the best-informed men of his age, and the greatest patron of literature. Angelo Politiano, who instructed the children of the duke, was commanded by the latter to admit Linaere to his lessons; under which circumstances the young student acquired a thorough acquaintance with the Latin language, so that he was even said to excel his master in elegance and correctness of style. His Greek master was Demetrius Chalcondylas. Printing was but a recent invention, and its first appearance in Italy did not take place till 1465. There can be little doubt that the edition of Homer, afterwards published by Demetrius Chalcondylas, was in progress at the time when Linaere enjoyed the benefit of the instructions of that learned man. Having acquired much classical knowledge, Linaere now left the court of Lorenzo, and went to study natural philosophy and medicine in Rome, under Hermolaus Barbarus. He made himself master of the writings of Aristotle and Galen, graduated at Padua, and returned to England. He now received the degree of M.D. from the university of Oxford, and began the practice of medicine in that city. He was soon made public professor of medicine, and gave lectures that summer: at the same time teaching the Greek language, as a private teacher connected with the university, there being at that time no regular professor of Greek. The reputation of Linaere increased rapidly, and he was not allowed to remain long in Oxford. Henry VII. having heard of his learning and medical talents, called him to court, and appointed him physician and preceptor to Prince Arthur. It is also said that he superintended the studies of the Princess Catharine of Spain, especially in the Italian language.

When Henry VIII. came to the throne, Linaere was at once at the head of the medical profession and of general literature in England. To him must be given much of the honour of having excited in his own country that spirit of learning which prevailed in his time. Nor was he wanting in attention to the cultivation of his own profession. In Oxford he founded two lectures on medicine, in connection with Merton college; and in Cambridge one, in St John's college. When Linaere commenced practice in England, the medical profession did not hold that respectable rank which it has since done. This depended entirely upon the character of the professors of it, who were chiefly monks and empirics, and upon the nature of those qualifications which procured a license to practise. In those days there was neither a college of physicians nor a college of surgeons, the members of which being of approved skill and learning, could take upon themselves the task of inquiring into the qualifications of those who proposed to practise the art. This task deferred upon the bishops, whose qualifications for it we may well suppose to have been of a very low order. While the practice of physic was engrossed by illiterate monks and empirics, the consequence was as already stated: it was reserved for Linaere to suggest a plan for remedying the evil. The foundation of the Royal

college of Physicians in London, in 1518, was the result of his influence with Cardinal Wolsey, and he had the honour of first sitting in the president's chair of that learned body.

A few years before his death, Linaere resigned his profession, and devoted himself to divinity. Having taken orders, he was first made rector of Marsham, in October, 1509. This he soon resigned, and accepted a prebend in the diocese of Wells, and afterwards, in 1518, in that of York. He held also a chanter'ship in the cathedral of York, which he soon resigned. It does not seem to be well ascertained what other preferments he had. Dr Knight says that he was a prebendary of St Stephens, in Westminster; Bishop Tanner mentions, that he held the rectory of Wigan, in Lancashire. It is difficult to divine the motives which led him to a choice of this profession at that period of life, and as much so to ascertain the causes of the frequent changes which he made. No one seems to suspect him of the desire of gain, for the nature of his preferments sufficiently prevent such a charge. He suffered, about this time, from the stone, of which he afterwards died, at the age of 64, on the 21st of October, 1524. He was buried in St Paul's cathedral, where a monument was erected to his memory in 1557, with an inscription by Dr Caius. The character of Linaere appears to be extremely worthy of admiration. Dr Caius, who succeeded him in his professional honours, describes him as a faithful friend, valued and beloved by all ranks of men, with an utter detestation of any thing trickish or dishonourable. His excellent good sense has been demonstrated by the active part he took in founding the college of physicians, at that time a very necessary institution. It may perhaps be doubted whether the constitution of that body be adapted to the circumstances of the present age; but its utility cannot be denied, especially in reference to the general principle on which it was founded. He was decidedly the most learned physician of his day, and even out of his own profession he held a high rank among men of science and learning. In conjunction with Colet, Lily, Grocyn, and Latimer, all of whom got their knowledge of the Greek tongue abroad, Linaere was one of the first to revive the learning of the ancients in his native country. His Latin style was, in the highest degree, elegant and accurate, so much so that his friend, Erasmus, thought it too elaborate. He translated into most elegant Latin several of the works of Galen. Two copies of this work, originally presented to Henry VIII. and Cardinal Wolsey, printed on vellum, are preserved in the British museum. He published a translation of 'Proclus de Sphæra,' in Latin, at Venice, 1499 and 1500. This was dedicated to his pupil, Prince Arthur. He also wrote, for the use of the Princess Mary, a treatise on the rudiments of grammar, afterwards published by Buchanan, in a Latin form, at Paris, in 1533. His treatise, 'De emendata structura Latini sermonis,' first printed at London in 1524, according to Dr Knight, has always been held in the highest estimation as a classical production.

John Skelton.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1461.—DIED A. D. 1529.

WE have the high authority of Erasmus for regarding this singular man as one of the 'lights and ornaments of English scholarship' in his day. He was laureated at Oxford, and must have given substantial proofs of proficiency in classical learning before he was chosen to superintend the studies of Henry VIII. On the accession of that monarch, Skelton was created orator-royal, but his ecclesiastical preferments seem to have been limited to the rectory of Diss, in Norfolk. His propensity to low and scurrilous satire, and the irregularities of his life, were insurmountable obstacles to clerical preferment, and he is even said to have been suspended by the bishop of Norwich, for his unseemly buffooneries in the pulpit. Perhaps he relied on his supposed influence with the king, to protect him against the consequences of these incessant invectives against some of the most potent characters of the day, in which it was his delight to indulge. Cardinal Wolsey and the catholics were the favourite objects of his coarse but pungent invective. The cardinal was at last roused to resentment and despatched his officers to arrest the daring satirist, but Skelton sought protection in the sanctuary of Westminster, where he was received by Abbot Islip, and sheltered till his death, which took place in 1529. Skelton's style is supposed, by Warton, to be an imitation of the Macaronic poetry first brought into fashion by Teofilo Folengo, a Benedictine monk of Casino. It is quite as vulgar, though not so *bizarre*, as that wretched burlesque of poetry. The subject of the following lines is the illustrious Sir Thomas More.

But now we have a knight
That is a man of might
All armed for to fight,
To put the truth to flight
By Bow-bell policy;
With his poetry,
And his sophistry,
To mock and make a lie,
With "quod he, and quod I,"
And his apology
Made for the prelacy;
Their huge pomp and pride
To colour and to hide.
He maketh no nobbes,
But with his dialogues
To prove our prelates gods
And laymen very lobbes,
And with their own rods.

Thus he taketh pain
To fable and to feign,
Their mischief to maintain,
And to have them reign
Over hill and plain;
Yea, over heaven and hell,
And where as spirits dwell,
In purgatory's holes,
With hot fire and coals,
To sing for silly souls,
With a supplication,
And a confutation
Without replication,
Having delectation
To make exclamation,
In his debellation
With a popish fashion,
To subvert our nation! &c. &c.

As Skelton's poems are in few hands, we shall cite another specimen, written in a gentler mood:

TO MISTRESS MARGARET HUSSEY.

Merry Margaret
As midsummer flower,
Gentle as falcon,

Or hawk of the tower,
With solace and gladness,
Much mirth and no madness,

All good, and no badness ;
 So joyously,
 So maidenly,
 So womanly,
 Her demeaning
 In every thing,
 Far, far passing
 That I can indite,
 Or suffice to write,
 Of merry Margaret,
 As midsummer flower,
 Gentle as falcon,
 Or hawk of the tower ;
 As patient and as still,

And as full of good will
 As fair Isiphil,
 Coliander,
 Sweet Pomander,
 Good Cassander ;
 Stedfast of thought,
 Well made, well wrought,
 Far may be sought
 Erst you can find
 So courteous, so kind,
 As merry Margaret,
 This midsummer flower,
 Gentle as falcon,
 Or hawk of the tower.

Sir John Bouchier, Lord Berners.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1469.—DIED A. D. 1532.

THIS distinguished translator of the admirable Froissart, was the grandson and heir of Sir John Bouchier, Lord Berners, Knight of the Garter, and constable of Windsor castle, in the reign of Edward the Fourth. As near as can be determined, he was born about the year 1469, and after finishing his education at Oxford, he proceeded to the continent, where he spent several years, but returned with sufficient reputation to obtain the honour of knighthood at the marriage of the duke of York. The insurrection which took place in Cornwall in 1497, under Michael Joseph, the farrier of Bodmin, afforded him an opportunity of proving his loyalty, and the conduct he displayed on that occasion obtained him the permanent favour of his sovereign. A field more agreeable, however, to his chivalrous character was opened to him in the war which Henry the Eighth, soon after his accession, commenced with France. At the siege of Terouenne—an undertaking as useless to the monarch, as it was fruitful in examples of individual heroism—Lord Berners acted as captain of the pioneers. For the merit he displayed in this and other instances, he was signally rewarded by the monarch, and received an appointment to the office of chancellor of the exchequer for life. Henry rendered him other marks of respect and attachment. When the princess Mary was sent to France to be married to Louis the Twelfth, Lord Berners occupied a chief place in her train, and not long after was appointed to the important post of governor of Calais. It has been remarked by Walpole, that he enjoyed the rare felicity of retaining Henry's favour during the space of eighteen years, that is, from the accession of the monarch till he died. This event happened while he was still governor of Calais, in the year 1532, and in the sixty-third of his age.

Lord Berners rendered an important service to English literature by his translation of Froissart,—an undertaking to which he was incited by the judicious advice of Henry VIII. The rich and varied narrative of the chronicler was well-adapted to improve as well as delight the readers of the period, when he made it known in our language. It was the finest example of modern history,—the noblest specimen of the genuine historic style of narrative employed to delineate passing events,—that had been produced since the revival of learning, and it could

scarcely become popular in the nation without giving rise to a considerable improvement in the taste of both readers and authors. Besides this translation, Lord Berners also gave to his countrymen versions of the History of King Arthur, and of the Life of Marcus Aurelius from the French; and of the Castle of Love from the Spanish. To these, may be added the address which he wrote on the Duties of the Inhabitants of Calais; an Account of the Exploits of Sir Hugh of Bourdeaux, and a comedy, entitled, 'Ite in Vineam,' which, it is reported, was usually acted in the great church of Calais after vespers, according to a custom then prevalent in England as well as on the continent.

Sir Thomas Wyatt the Elder.

BORN A. D. 1503.—DIED A. D. 1542.

SIR THOMAS WYATT, descended from an ancient and illustrious family, was born in 1503, at Allington castle in Kent. After completing his education at St John's college, Cambridge,¹ he obtained a place at court, where his noble person, his polished manners, his skill in feats of arms, and more than all, his commanding talents, fortified by deep learning, and adorned by brilliant wit, soon raised him to a conspicuous elevation, and procured for him the favour and esteem of Henry the Eighth in no stinted measure. His poetic powers early developed themselves in sonnets and odes addressed to the court-beauties, but especially to the unfortunate Anne Boleyn, for whom, both before and after her marriage, he seems—if we may rely on the somewhat doubtful testimony of his poems—to have entertained a warm affection. Though it must have been difficult for any man to gaze unmoved on the attractions of so lovely a being as Anne, and for any woman to receive with indifference the adulation of so gallant and accomplished a cavalier as Wyatt, yet their intercourse cannot have involved any ardent passion, since Wyatt had been married at a very early age to a daughter of Lord Cobham, and his grave religious cast of mind, and irreproachable character, suffice to vindicate him from any charge of criminal feelings, and to warrant the conclusion that his affection for Anne was nothing more than one of the many Platonic attachments which were generated and fostered by the fantastic spirit of the age. He is said to have been greatly instrumental in furthering the Reformation by his private influence over the king's mind, and by the singular wit and subtlety with which he insinuated the readiest means of effecting that mighty change. His abilities were not allowed to waste themselves on the idle fopperies of a court.

In 1537 he was sent as ambassador to conduct a very delicate and intricate negotiation with the emperor of Spain, and although trammelled by the caprice of Henry, the insincerity of the Spanish court, and more than all by the jealousy or folly of Bonner and others, who were subsequently appointed his colleagues, he discharged the arduous duties of his office with a skill and boldness which obtained for

¹ Antony Wood says that Wyatt after studying at Cambridge went to Oxford, but there does not seem to be any better authority for this than honest Antony's anxiety to trace all eminent men to the banks of the Isis.

him the warm and repeated thanks of his sovereign. The chicanery of diplomacy, however, soon disgusted Wyatt's open and manly mind. In his letters to the king and to Cromwell, he made frequent and earnest applications for a recal, but so valuable were his services deemed, that his wishes were not complied with until 1539, and scarcely had he withdrawn to his magnificent seat on the banks of the Medway, there to indulge in the pleasant labours of a literary retirement, when he was again summoned to the ungrateful task of watching the intrigues of the Spanish court. Distasteful as was the employment, he fulfilled the trust reposed in him ably and well, until Henry, though with great reluctance, assented to his entreaties for a recal. New troubles awaited him on his return to England. On the downfall of Cromwell—to whose party he had steadily clung—Wyatt was thrown into prison, on the ground of some obsolete charges brought against him by the notorious Bonner, who had now gained the ascendancy, and with the petty malice of his grovelling mind, felt well-disposed to use his power for the destruction of one, before whose intellectual superiority he had cringed into his native nothingness. After a long and severe imprisonment, Wyatt was brought to trial in June 1541. The accusation brought against him was that of treachery to the king's interests in his embassies to Spain, and as he was not allowed either counsel or the right of cross-examining the witnesses, his defence was limited to a single oration. This oration is still extant, and considering the circumstances in which it was made, deserves to rank with our best specimens of judicial pleading. After proving his own innocence, he proceeded in a strain of the most lacerating sarcasm to analyse Bonner's character and motives, and in so clear a light did he represent the compassionate stupidity, and atrocious malice of his accuser, that the jury brought in a verdict of acquittal. Being thus delivered from his enemies, Wyatt retired to Allington castle, 'among the muses, there to read and rhyme,' and soon became the centre of attraction to much of the learning and talents of the country. Mason, Poynt, the learned Leland, and the illustrious Surrey, were his frequent visitors and constant friends. What effects the fruits of Wyatt's leisure, and of the association of so many eminent men might have produced on the literary character of the age, had they not been nipped in the bud, it is impossible with certainty to determine. The experiment was not tried. This ornament of his country, as Leland terms him, was carried off by a malignant fever in the autumn of 1542, in the 39th year of his age. The number of epitaphs written on him, and the unbounded praise of his virtues which they contain, show the high estimation in which he was held by his contemporaries. Leland's *Nænia*, and Surrey's plaintive strains, would have immortalized him, even had his works perished with him.

To Wyatt's merits as a poet the highest praise that can be given is, that he was Surrey's coadjutor in reforming English poetry. He is superior to his illustrious friend in masculine power, in depth of reflection, and in learning; but he wants the graceful fancy, the easy flow, the melancholy sweetness, and above all, the exquisite good taste which characterise 'Surrey's deathless lay.' Many of his poems are written rhythmically, and still more are prosaic in their conception. They are indeed generally

Set high in spirit with the precious taste
Of sweet philosophy,

but they are frequently deficient in 'Poetry's peculiar food, sacred invention.' His contemporaries regarded the paraphrase of the seven penitential psalms as the work which would have handed down his name to posterity. Surrey asks in one of his most beautiful poems,

What holy grave, what worthy sepulture,
For Wyatt's psalms shall Christians then purchase?

In spite of this commendation, posterity seems to have assigned oblivion as their sepulture, and without injustice. Decidedly the best of his poetical performances is the second satire, which, in addition to the noble sentiments of an exalted and lettered mind, displays a more flowing rhythm and purer poetic diction, than he usually employs. It is much to be lamented that he has left us so few prose compositions. The oration already mentioned, and his letters to the king and to Cromwell on the business of his embassies, were by much the finest prose our language had yet produced. They display here and there an easy fluency, a happiness of expression, a polished keenness of sarcasm, and a nervous eloquence worthy of a more advanced age of literature; nor can we omit to mention his two noble letters to his son, which, as indications of a spirit animated throughout by a sublime morality, and illumined by the purest light of philosophy, we scruple not to compare with any similar compositions in the language. He was, in short, a man of deep learning,¹ 'in that rude age when knowledge was not rife;' and this learning was applied to use by a mind which united, in no ordinary degree, playful wit and acute shrewdness, with masculine grasp of intellect and profound reflection.

His works are generally printed along with those of Surrey.

Howard, Earl of Surrey.

BORN A. D. 1516.—DIED A. D. 1547.

THE history of few would afford richer topics for the pen of the biographer than this nobleman, were it not that the age in which he lived, instead of handing down to us a faithful record of his life and actions, has transmitted little more than a fanciful romance, with which we long contented ourselves, though, when the dream passed away before the penetrating light of examination, we found, like the Arabian castle-builder with his basket of glass, that not only had these airy fictions vanished, but that the less showy, though more substantial reality, was also lost. There are still, however, some few traces of the man; and, which is of more importance, 'his works live after him.'

He was the oldest son of the third duke of Norfolk, and was born in 1516, or 1518, at Kenninghall in Norfolkshire. We have no account of his boyish years on which reliance can be placed, but the known anxiety of the Howard family to procure able instructors for their children, and the literary eminence of many of his relations,¹

¹ Camden calls him 'splendide doctus.'

¹ Parker, Lord Morley, Lord Berners, the well-known translator of Froissart, and Edward Vere, earl of Oxford, a considerable contributor to the 'Paradise of Dainty Devises,' were among his relations. His father too was a man of letters, and from a poem of Skelton's it appears that his mother honoured the 'priests of the muses.'

give us ample assurance that he was supplied with every aid and incentive to the study of letters, and his writings show that they were not supplied in vain. His education was probably completed in 1531 or 1532, for in one of these years he was affianced, and soon afterwards married to the Lady Frances Vere, daughter to the earl of Oxford. In 1532, as we are informed by Holinshed, Surrey was one of those who attended Henry the Eighth into France, to the 'Field of the Cloth of Gold.' After witnessing this gorgeous spectacle, he is said to have accompanied his young friend, the duke of Richmond, a natural son of the king, to study in the university of Paris; but if he went there at all, his stay must have been short, as we find him, in the commencement of the ensuing year, bearing a part in the coronation of his cousin, Anne Boleyn. It is not a little striking, that one of the next notices of his life we meet with, is that he sat, in 1536, as earl-marshal, in his father's stead, at the trial and condemnation of this unhappy queen, whose elevation to the highest of earthly dignities, in all the pride of beauty and power, he had witnessed so shortly before. The lesson was instructive and ominous. His eldest son, Thomas, afterwards duke of Norfolk, was born in this year. It is a curious proof of the power of superstition in that age over the wisest and best-educated, that Surrey had his son's nativity cast. If we may rely on the account given in the Ashmole MSS., the prophecy coincided most singularly with the event, since it predicted to the child a life of sorrow and misfortune, and to the father an untimely death.

It is in the following year, 1537, that Surrey's romantic tour through Italy is said to have been made. The current account of this adventure is, that Surrey, being smitten with love of the Lady Geraldine, went on a knight-errant expedition to maintain her beauty in the principal cities of Italy, but especially in Florence, where he was proclaimed victor at a tournament held in her honour, and where, too, he met with Cornelius Agrippa, who showed him the Lady Geraldine in a magic mirror. The lovers of the marvellous will not be ready to believe, that the whole of this wild story is founded on an extravagant romance of Nash's, entitled the 'History of Jack Wilton,' in which, among other edifying scenes, Cornelius Agrippa, at the request of Erasmus, summons up the ghost of Cicero, which pronounces the Roscian oration before the doctors and scholars, among whom was Luther of the university of Wittenberg. Drayton took hold of this story as the foundation for one of 'England's heroical epistles,' and from him it was copied with even more than his usual simplicity, by Anthony Wood. But had the tale a better foundation than Nash's romance, it could be easily disproved otherwise: for not to mention the extreme improbability of Surrey's having ever visited Italy—of which we have no mention in his writings—there is indisputable evidence of his having been in England during the years 1536—37—38, and moreover the Lady Geraldine, in whose honour these feats of arms are said to have been performed, was at this period not more than ten or eleven years of age. To this it may be added, as decisive of the point at issue, though no one has hitherto noticed it in confuting this absurd fiction, that not a single line in any of the poems Surrey addressed to Geraldine, mentions his having tilted in her honour, or visited foreign lands to celebrate her beauty. There was, however, some slight foundation

for this story in the attachment Surrey unquestionably bore to Geraldine. This lady, the English Laura, was a daughter of the earl of Kildare, and is said to have been the greatest beauty of her time. That she was no mean adept in coquetry, appears from her lover's poems,² and so cruel did she at length become, that he renounced all affection for her, 'who had always been cause of his miscease,' and plunging into public life, soon forgot his tormentress. It has been deemed a stain on Surrey's reputation, that he was at the period of this attachment a married man; but when it is remembered that he was living in perfect harmony with his wife, and always sustained a high moral character, it will not be difficult to reconcile the warmth of affection portrayed in his poems with a mere Platonic attachment,—a species of romantic gallantry peculiarly suited to his speculative mind, and no ways uncommon in that singular age, when the spirit of chivalry, as yet unbroken, though purified and exalted by learning, combined with the vigour of fancy peculiar to the dawn of a national literature, to produce those wide variations from ordinary habits and characters which afforded such ample materials to the dramatists of the ensuing age.

From this period, the events of Surrey's life are better ascertained. In 1540 he was the foremost of the defendants at a tournament given by Henry in honour of his marriage with the Lady Anne of Cleves, and acquitted himself with marked distinction. At the close of this year he was sent into France to examine the state of the defences within the English pale, a charge which he executed, we are told, "entirely to the king's satisfaction." In the autumn of the following year he was made steward of the university of Cambridge, and not long after, a knight of the garter. In 1543 he went as a volunteer in the armament sent against France, under the command of Sir John Wallop, and by his conduct gained so much reputation, that, in 1544, he was appointed marshal of the army at the head of which Henry invaded France in person. While the king and one part of the army laid siege to Boulogne, Norfolk and Surrey with the remaining forces encamped before Montreuil, but, being ill supplied with provisions and ammunition, in consequence, it is said, of the intrigues of the earl of Hertford, the ruling favourite, who looked with a jealous eye on the power of the Howards, they failed in their efforts to reduce the place, though all was done that skill could devise or valour accomplish. Surrey ably seconded his father, distinguishing himself repeatedly by his chivalrous courage, and on one occasion was dangerously wounded in a daring attempt to take the town by storm. On the approach of the dauphin, they were compelled to raise the siege, and returned in unmerited disgrace to England. It is probable that from this period we are to date Henry's dislike to the Howards, though it was not manifested at the time, since Surrey, in 1545, was appointed to the command of Boulogne, then the most important station in our French dominions. During the short period of his command, he displayed so much courage, energy, and military skill, as to gain him the reputation of being one of the most distinguished soldiers of the day. He several times, with inferior forces, signally defeated the French; but being slightly worsted

² Vide the conclusion of that commencing, 'Wrapt in my careless cloak, as I walk to and fro.'

on one occasion, he was recalled in April, 1646, by his capricious sovereign. He was committed to the Tower soon after his return, in consequence of his having uttered some vague threats against the all-powerful favourite, the earl of Hertford, to whom, probably with justice, he ascribed his undeserved disgrace. His confinement cannot have been of long duration, for in the following October he took part in the magnificent reception given to the French ambassador when he came over to negotiate a peace. This was the closing scene of Surrey's prosperity. On the ensuing 12th of December he was committed to the Tower, at the instigation, in all probability, of the earl of Hertford, who, as the king evidently drew near his end, was anxious to secure to himself the possession of the protectorate after Henry's death, and saw a dangerous obstacle in the power of the Howard family. The charges brought against him were the most inane and trivial on which a man's life was ever sworn away, amounting to nothing more than that he had quartered with his own the arms of Edward the Confessor, and therefore, it was argued, aspired to the crown.³ On his trial, Surrey showed that he had the authority of the herald's college for wearing these arms, and that he had frequently worn them without reprimand in the presence of Henry himself. We have little or no account of the trial, or of Surrey's behaviour during it, save the general statement of Lord Herbert,—that "the earl, as he was a man of a deep understanding, sharp wit, and deep courage, defended himself many ways; sometimes denying their accusations as false, and together weakening the credit of his adversaries; sometimes interpreting the words he said in a far other sense than they were represented."⁴ In spite of the palpable absurdity of the charges, the jury were base enough to find him guilty of high treason, in compliance with the known wish of the court; and the chancellor, Wriothesley, pronounced on him sentence of death. He was, in consequence, beheaded on Tower Hill, on the 19th of January, 1647, in the thirtieth year of his age. In a very few days after, he was followed to the tomb by the ferocious bigot and merciless sensualist whose tyranny had consigned to an early grave the most gallant and accomplished gentleman of the age.

Time, which is the parent of truth, in no way more shows its power, than in the silent speed with which it reduces to their inherent nothingness the accidental splendours of external greatness. The earl of Surrey, though descended from England's proudest and most powerful peers, and possessed of every honour which wealth, title, or royal favour could heap upon him, would now be immortal only in genealogical charts, or in the records of the Herald's college, were it not that nature and study had endowed him with a genius which needed no fortuitous advantages to win a lasting renown. The high-born earl,—the successful soldier,—the all-accomplished courtier,—are forgotten, and men remember 'the gentle Surrey' only as a poet. His poems are formed on the model of Petrarch and Chaucer combined, and, though rarely soaring so high as their originals, are free from some of the faults of both. They are not characterised by much masculine power, sublimity of conception, or brilliancy of imagery; the charm lies in their sweetness of thought, their

³ Among the deponents against him, it is melancholy to find his sister, the duchess of Richmond, the most prominent.

⁴ Lord Herbert's reign of Henry VIII.

graceful fancy, their happiness of expression, their exquisite good taste, and, above all, in their evidently emanating from nature and feeling. Nor is it their least merit, that, though written in a rude age, they contain not a single expression which could shock the nicest delicacy. When regarded in connection with the times in which they were produced, they claim a much higher rank. Surrey was the great reformer of English poetry. Previous to his time all our poetry, even Chaucer's,⁵ had been written rhythmically, not metrically, and, by consequence, the language had been wrenched from its natural pronunciation to suit the difficulties of rhythmical verse. Nor was this the worst feature. After Chaucer, a race of poets had sprung up, who, unable to cope with, or imitate their great predecessor, attempted to eke out a beggarly meagreness of thought and invention, by a high-sounding Thrasonical and pedantic phrasology, which ought to have secured them a whipping for oe'r-doing Termagant. Surrey's fine mind perceived these faults, and his intimate acquaintance with the poets of ancient and modern Italy enabled him to apply the remedies. He reduced our poetry to metrical rules, thereby establishing a true standard of pronunciation; and, disdaining to interweave absurd Latinisms with our native tongue, he resorted to the 'pure wells of English undefiled,' and gave us a poetic diction suited to metrical verse in our naturalized Saxon dialect. This, however, is not his only excellence. He introduced into our language blank verse. All writers agree, that his translation of the second and fourth books of the *Æneid* is the first specimen of this species of verse in our language. He saw, with the intuitive perception of a refined and cultivated mind, that, in the English tongue, rhyme trammelled sublimity of thought, and the expression of deep and commanding passion, and he supplied the defect by introducing the metre which has since been hallowed by the more than mortal imagination of Shakspeare, and the unmatched grandeur of Milton.

Of Surrey's character, it is difficult to speak in too high terms of commendation. The very pride of ancestry, which in most men is folly, appeared in him a virtue, since it inspired him with the noble ambition of doing 'something, such that after ages should not willingly let it die.' Amiable in his family,—steady and ardent in his friendships,—endowed with more than the hereditary valour of the Howards,—steadfast in adhering to truth,—moral in a licentious age,—lofty, but not grasping, in his ambition,—learned in all the wisdom of the times, without being pedantic,—we may justly apply to him what Ford says of one of his heroes:—

—One so young and goodly,
So sweet in his nature, any story
Hath seldom mentioned.

Surrey's works were frequently reprinted in the reign of Elizabeth and James, but of late years they have been in a great measure forgotten. The more modern editions are,—*Poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and Sir Thomas Wyatt*; London, 1717, 8vo.; with a preface by Dr Jewel.' This is in almost every respect an execrable edition. *The Works of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and Sir Thomas Wyatt the elder*; London, 1824, 2 vols. 4to.; edited by G. F. Nott.' This is a

⁵ Mr Tyrrwhit, in his edition of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, disputes this; his reasoning is ingenious, but, we apprehend, unsatisfactory.

work of great research, and, in some respects, invaluable, though the poems are almost overwhelmed by a mass of notes, lives, dissertations, appendices, &c. 'Surrey and Wyatt's Poems, in Pickering's Aldine Poets; 1832.'

John Leland.

DIED A. D. 1552.

THIS industrious antiquary was born in London, early in the 16th century, and was educated at St Paul's school, under that prince of pedagogues, William Lily. He studied first at Cambridge, and subsequently at Oxford. On quitting the latter university, he went, for further improvement, to Paris, where in the society of such men as Budæus, Faber, Paulus Æmilius, and Francis Sylvius, he not only perfected himself in the classical languages, but also acquired very considerable proficiency in French, Italian, and Spanish. He had previously, while at Oxford, paid considerable attention to the ancient tongues of his own country.

On his return home, he entered into orders, and was appointed one of the king's chaplains. Henry also appointed him his librarian, and, by a commission, dated in 1533, dignified him with the title of king's antiquary, with authority to search after "England's antiquities, and peruse the libraries of all cathedrals, abbeys, priories, colleges, &c., and places where records, writings, and secrets of antiquity, were deposited," for the purpose of illustrating the ancient history and the antiquities of the realm. This appointment exactly suited Leland's genius; and a handsome salary being annexed to it, our antiquary was left at full liberty to devote himself entirely to the duties of his office. He entered upon them with the greatest eagerness, and immediately undertook a tour throughout the kingdom, for the purpose of carrying his plans into full effect. Gifted with a sound constitution, with indefatigable perseverance, with the true staunch scent of an antiquary, and armed with the potent authority of a royal commission, Leland set out on his travels throughout England and Wales, with the determination to traverse the length and breadth of the land, until he had put himself in possession of every fact which could aid him in his task of elucidating the antiquities of Britain. Not contented with ransacking the archives and libraries of every church, and monastery, and cathedral, in the kingdom, he wandered from house to house, poking and prying into every corner in which his lively fancy suggested some precious relic of ancient times might be sheltered. Not a district, however remote,—scarcely a single spot,—escaped his scrutiny. At last, after six long years of toil and travel, he returned to the metropolis, laden with the '*spolia opima*' of his arduous enterprise. The king was pleased to commend his antiquary's industry and zeal, and, as a mark of his approbation, bestowed on him the rich living of Hasely, in Oxfordshire, together with a prebendary in the cathedral church of Sarum.

In 1545, he presented his majesty with the first-fruits of his antiquarian toils, as a new year's gift. It was a digest of that part of his collections which related to the principal authors of the kingdom. Im-

mediately after this, he retired to a house of his own, in the neighbourhood of London, where he employed himself for nearly six uninterrupted years in arranging and digesting his immense collections. The labour which he thus imposed upon himself gradually overpowered his constitution, until, at last, nature gave way in the struggle, and reason, as well as health, forsook the emaciated student. He died on the 18th of April, 1552.

Leland's papers were first consigned to the custody of Sir John Cheke, who would probably have made some important use of them had he not been prevented by the troubles which followed the death of Edward VI. On his retirement to the continent, Sir John placed four folio volumes of Leland's collections in the hands of Mr Purefoy, from whom they descended to Barton, the author of a history of Leicestershire, who left them, along with eight other volumes of Leland's MSS., forming what is called his 'Itinerary,' to the Bodleian library. The only other portion of Leland's MSS. is in the Cottonian collection. Of all these, Holinshed, Drayton, Camden, Dugdale, Stowe, Lambard, Wood, and others, have availed themselves in their historical remarks. Hearne has ably edited the 'Itinerary' and 'Collectanea.' His 'Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis' was published in 1709, in two volumes octavo.

Sir John Cheke.

BORN A. D. 1514.—DIED A. D. 1557.

THIS eminent scholar and promoter of literature, was born at Cambridge, in 1514, and educated there in St John's college. He very early obtained a fellowship, and was also chosen orator to the university. At the age of twenty-six, he had acquired such a reputation for learning, that he was made professor of Greek. In this capacity he endeavoured to introduce many improvements, especially in the mode of pronouncing that language. But Gardiner, bishop of Winchester and chancellor of the university, forbade all innovation. Cheke replied to the chancellor, and cited Erasmus and other celebrated scholars in defence of his improvements. But the authority of the bishop was infallible, and yet the innovations and improvements of Cheke prevailed. At the age of thirty, he was sent for by Henry VIII. to come to court to assist in the education of the prince Edward and to give lessons to Elizabeth. He obeyed, and entered with zeal and pleasure upon his new occupation. He was greatly honoured and handsomely rewarded by the king, being made a canon of Christ's church, Oxford. An inference has been founded upon this fact, that Cheke was in orders. But although he held this canonry, and also the rectory of Leverington in Norfolk, it does not necessarily follow that he ever took orders. There are instances of such and even higher ecclesiastical offices being held by laymen. The laws of the church were often dispensed with in the case of court-favourites. On the accession of Edward VI. Cheke was made provost of king's college, Cambridge, and received also several valuable manors and an annuity. There can be no doubt that the young king was under great obligation to Cheke for the sound and

pious education he had received, and that this sense of obligation on his part contributed to maintain Cheke in his post of tutor, notwithstanding some shocks which his influence suffered through his connection with the duke of Somerset. He was knighted in 1551, and received from the king a handsome estate. About the same time he distinguished himself in a disputation at court with some eminent catholics, and is said to have displayed great ability also in another disputation at Cambridge. Promotion to influence and honour now almost daily awaited him. He was made clerk of the council, then secretary of state and privy councillor. But the death of the youthful king totally reversed his fortunes, and cast a fatal cloud over the prospects of the protestant religion.

Cheke was induced to enter into the fatal project of transferring the crown to Jane Grey. He even accepted the office of secretary to her council. On the defeat of that hasty and ill-concerted project, he was committed as a traitor to the Tower, but was pardoned without being brought to trial. After suffering the confiscation of his estates, he obtained leave to travel for a limited time. On the continent he engaged in directing the studies of some English gentlemen, first at Basil, then at Padua. The time of his leave of absence having expired, and deeming it unsafe to venture back into England, he took up his abode at Strasburg. But his non-appearance at court at the appointed time led to the confiscation of the property that remained to him in England, and, in consequence, he was obliged to undertake the labours of tuition for a maintenance. He either engaged as Greek professor at Strasburg, or set up a public lecture in that language. Having continued there a short time, his persecutors resolved to make a prisoner of him. He was accordingly drawn by an invitation from Lord Paget and Sir John Mason, in 1556, to pay a visit to Brussels, where his wife and some other friends then were. It appears that these noblemen had been his former friends, but having become converts to popery and to the measures of Queen Mary, were now ready to betray their friend to serve the same cause. Cheke is said also to have been induced to undertake this journey by his confidence in astrology, to which he was greatly addicted, and by which he had divined that his journey would be a safe and prosperous one. However, he found to his cost, that his astrology was as treacherous as his friends. Between Antwerp and Brussels, he was seized by order of Philip II., bound and hoodwinked, and then conveyed on board a ship and so brought at once to the Tower of London. Here he was visited by various priests, whose object was to induce him to abandon his principles. The argument which these persecutors employed was too powerful for his resolution. They placed before him his martyrdom or recantation, and from day to day plied him with their threats. At length his fears prevailed,—he submitted, signed his recantation, and, before the court, signified his humiliation. His lands were restored, but his peace of mind was gone. Besides the remorse of conscience which now preyed upon him, he was constrained to be present and hear the examination and witness the condemnation of the protestants. This altogether was more than he could bear, and after pining away for some time, he gradually sunk under the stroke of death at the age of forty-three. He died September 1557, and was buried in St Alban's, Woodstock. He translated the

II. and VI. Homilies of Chrysostom; wrote also 'The Hurt of Sedition how grievous it is to a Commonwealth,' 1549. 'Two Latin epistles on the death of Bucer,' 1551, 4to. A Latin poem on the death of Sir Anthony Denny. 'De Pronuntiatione Græcæ potissimum linguæ Disputationes,' Basil, 1555. 'De Superstitione ad Regem Henricum;' 'Epigrammata varia, cum Græce tum Latine conscripta.' A Latin version of Cranmer on the Lord's Supper, and of the English Communion-book. He wrote many works besides, which remain in manuscript, and also commenced a new version of the Bible; the gospel of Matthew remains as a specimen at Bennett college, Cambridge.

Sebastian Cabot.*

BORN A. D. 1475.—DIED A. D. 1557.

AN elaborate memoir of this eminent navigator, published in 1831,¹ has enabled us to do more justice to his memory than his earlier biographers have done. We state this at the outset of our sketch; for a more elaborate and acute piece of biography than the work to which we refer has not appeared for many years, and we should feel that we were depriving the author of his honest and well-earned fame, if, on the strength of his singularly laborious and well-conducted researches, we proceeded at once to correct the blunders and expose the ignorance of preceding writers, without intimating the source of our superior information.

Sebastian Cabot was born at Bristol about the year 1475. When he was four years old, he was taken by his father, Sir John Cabot, or John Gavotta, to Venice, the city of his ancestors, where he resided for some time. This circumstance, united to that of his parentage, has given some colour to the Italian account, which claims him for a countryman, and affirms that he was born at Venice, and which seems to have been implicitly received, not merely by Hakluyt, Purchas, and Churchill, but by Hume, Forster, Charlevoix, and Barrow. The authority on this point is indisputable, although it has been strangely overlooked for nearly three centuries. In Richard Eden's 'Decades of the New World,'—a rare and curious black letter volume, published in 1555,—the following marginal note occurs on page 255: "Sebastian Cabot tould me that he was born in Brystowe, and that at iiii. years ould he was carried with his father into Venice, and so returned agayne into England with his father, after certayne years, whereby he was thought to have been born in Venice."

Sebastian manifested a decided inclination to the life of a sailor, was early instructed in all the branches of navigation, and was allowed to make several short trips to sea, in order to acquire a competent knowledge of the practical part of his profession. Europe was at this period 'ringing from side to side' with the discoveries of the Portuguese in the east, and the still more brilliant and important ones of Columbus, in the western hemisphere. And the young Cabot warmly partook of the general en-

* To avoid introducing another series of memoirs, we have arranged our articles of scientific and literary biography under the same head.

¹ Lond. 8vo.

thusiasm. Speaking of the effect produced in England by the news of the discoveries of Columbus, he says, "all men, with great admiration, affirm it to be a thing more divine than human;" and, afterwards, he adds, "by this fame and report, there increased in my heart a great flame of desire to attempt some notable thing." Happily the flame was cherished. It was in 1493 that Columbus returned from his first expedition; and, on the 5th of March, 1496, a patent was granted by Henry VII. to John Cabot and his three sons, Lewis, Sebastian, and Sancius, authorising them, their heirs, or deputies, to "sail to all parts, countries, and seas of the east, and of the west, and of the north, under our banners and ensigns, with five ships, of what burden or quantity soever they may be; to seek out, discover, and find, whatsoever isles, countries, regions, or provinces, of the heathen and infidels, whatsoever they be, and in what part of the world soever they be, which before this time have been unknown to all Christians."² The monarch, in granting the patent, however, stipulated for one-fifth part of the profits which might arise from any enterprise undertaken upon it. The mention of the father's name in this patent, has led many to suppose that he also was a distinguished navigator; but of this, notwithstanding what Hakluyt says,³ there is no conclusive evidence. It has never been affirmed that all the sons engaged in the voyage, and yet the presumption is just as strong with regard to each of them as to the father. All that we know of the latter is, that he came to England, 'to follow the trade of merchandise.' Might not the wary king be looking to the funds of the wealthy Venetian as the best security for his portion, and for the faithful execution of the terms of the patent? The expedition sailed from Bristol in the Spring of 1497, with the view of exploring a northern passage to India. Cabot first directed his course to Iceland, and thence launched out into the unknown seas of the west. On the 24th of June, 1497, he came in sight of land, to his great surprise, "not thinking to find any other land than that of Cathay." This land was the continent of North America: for, although some modern authorities assert that Cabot went no farther north than the latitude of 56°,⁴ it appears from Ramusio's preface to the third volume of his 'Collection of Voyages,' that he actually penetrated as far north as 67°. He even sailed a considerable distance into Hudson's Bay; but the crew wanted the enthusiasm of their captain, and, getting tired of the difficulties and toils which they here encountered, compelled him reluctantly to return to England.

Nothing dampened by the experience of the past, we find our young navigator no sooner landed upon his native shores, than making application for another patent to enable him to set out again on a fresh voyage of discovery. His request was granted, and a new patent issued on the 3d of February, 1498. The discovery of this important document by his recent biographer, after a tedious search in the Roll's chapel, has effectually cleared up a point of great consequence in the memoir of Sebastian, and the annals of English navigation. It gives authority to John Kabotto, "that he, by him, his deputy, or deputies sufficient, may take at his pleasure vi. English shippes in any porte or portes, or other places within this our realme of

² Rymer's *Fœdera*.³ Vol. iii. 9.⁴ Kerr's *Collection of Voyages*, vol. xviii. 353.

England, or obeisance, so that, and if the said shippes be of the bourdeyn of cc. tonnes or under, with their apparail requisite and necessarie for the safe conduct of the said shippes, and them convey and lede to the Londe and Isles of late found by the same John in our name, and by oure commaundement." Here is distinct testimony to the important fact, that Sebastian Cabot was the first discoverer, or—if the Northmen did actually reach America in the 11th century—the first civilized discoverer of the continent of America. For it is matter of history, that Columbus did not effect that discovery on which his fame rests, till his third voyage, upon which he set sail on the 30th of May, 1498; but Sebastian, as we have seen, discovered Labrador in the month of June of the preceding year. Of the results of this second expedition little is known; nor do we hear any thing of Sebastian for a period of fourteen or fifteen years after his second return to England.

In 1512, he entered into the service of Spain; but, on the death of King Ferdinand, he returned to England. In 1517, he sailed on an expedition of discovery, but was forced to put back by a mutiny of his crew. In 1518, we find him again in the employment of the court of Spain, as pilot-major; and, in 1526, he took the command of an expedition to the Molucca islands, on behalf of a company formed at Seville. In this charge he visited Brazil, and afterwards explored the river La Plata as far as a small island nearly opposite where Buenos Ayres now stands, whence he proceeded to the Parana, which he explored to its junction with the Paraguay. There is reason to believe that Cabot, during his residence in South America, formed a plan for the conquest of Peru, and communicated his views to the court of Spain.

In 1548, Cabot returned to England. What the precise motives were which induced him to resign his honourable and lucrative post in the Spanish marine, are not precisely known; but there is sufficient evidence of the high estimation in which the English sailor was held abroad, in the formal and urgent demand made by the Spanish ambassador, that "Sebastian Cabot, grand pilot of the emperor's Indies, then in England, might be sent over to Spain, as a very necessary man for the emperor, whose servant he was, and had a pension of him." The demand was not complied with; but a pension of 250 marks, (£166 13s. 6d.) with the office of grand pilot of England, were conferred upon him by Edward VI. It was by the advice of Cabot that Sir Hugh Willoughby's expedition to the north of Europe was undertaken. The scheme completely succeeded, and opened up a lucrative trade to the English merchants with Russia. His death took place about the year 1557. His faithful friend, Richard Eden, attended him in his last moments, and has left on record some particulars of the scene, which exhibit the master-passion of Cabot's mind holding its sway to the last. Eden laments that, "even in the article of death, he had not shaken off all worldlie vaine glorie," for he talked flightily about a divine revelation to him of a new and infallible method of finding the longitude, which he was not permitted to disclose to any mortal. "When we remember," says the biographer whose labours have vindicated for Cabot his title to the highest rank in the annals of maritime discovery,—"when we remember the earnest religious feelings exhibited in the instructions of Sir Hugh Willoughby, and which formed so decided a feature of Cabot's character, it is impossible to conceive a stronger

proof of the influence of long-cherished habits of thought, than that his decaying faculties, at this awful moment, were yet entangled with the problem which continues to this day to vex and elude the human intellect. The dying seaman was again, in imagination, on that beloved ocean over whose billows his intrepid and adventurous youth had opened a pathway, and whose mysteries had occupied him longer than the allotted span of ordinary life. The date of his death is not known, nor, except presumptively, the place where it occurred. From the presence of Eden, we may infer that he died in London. It is not known where his remains were deposited. The claims of England in the New World have been uniformly and justly rested on his discoveries. Proposals of colonization were urged, on the clearness of the title thus acquired, and the shame of abandoning it. The English language would probably be spoken in no part of America but for Sebastian Cabot. The commerce of England and her navy are admitted to have been deeply,—incalculably,—his debtors. Yet there is reason to fear, that in his extreme age, the allowance which had been solemnly granted to him for life, was fraudulently broken in upon. His birth place we have seen denied. His fame has been obscured by the English writers, and every vile calumny against him eagerly adopted and circulated. All his own maps and discoveries, ‘drawn and written by himself,’ which it was hoped might come out in print,—‘because so worthy monuments should not be buried in perpetual oblivion,’—have been buried in perpetual oblivion. He gave a continent to England, yet no one can point to the few feet of earth she has allowed him in return.”

Thomas, Lord Vaux.

BORN A. D. 1510.—DIED CIRC. A. D. 1558.

THOMAS, LORD VAUX of Harwedon or Harrowden, in Northamptonshire, was the eldest son of Nicholas, the first Lord Vaux, with whom he has been confounded by Wood and others. He succeeded his father in 1523, and accompanied Cardinal Wolsey’s splendid embassy to Francis I. In 1530, he took his place in parliament as a baron, and in 1532, he attended the king in his expedition to Calais. He received the order of the bath at the coronation of Anne Boleyn, and was for some time captain of the island of Jersey. He died in the latter end of Mary’s reign. A considerable number of poetical pieces by this nobleman are found in the ‘Paradise of Dainty Devices.’ Mr Ellis ascribes two poems in Tottel’s collection: viz. ‘The assault of Cupid,’ and that which begins ‘I loath that I did love,’ to him. From the prologue to Sackville’s ‘Induction,’ in the ‘Mirror for Magistrates,’ it would seem that Lord Vaux had undertaken to write a history of King Edward’s two sons who were murdered in the Tower, but he did not accomplish the task. Mr Ritson assigns a place among the English poets to William, son of this nobleman, but adduces no authority for doing so. There is a pleasing lightness and ease of versification in the following stanzas from Lord Vaux’s poems, entitled ‘The aged Lover’s Renunciation of Love:’

These hairs of age are messengers
Which bid me fast repent and pray;
They be of death the harbingers,
That doth prepare and dress the way;
Wherefore I joy that you may see
Upon my head such hairs to be.

They be the lives that lead the length,
How far my race was for to run;
They say my youth is fled with strength,
And how old age is well begun;
The which I feel, and you may see
Such lives upon my head to be.

They be the strings of sober sound,
Whose music is harmonical;
Their tunes declare a time from ground
I came, and how thereto I shall;
Wherefore I love that you may see
Upon my head such hairs to be.

God grant to those that white hairs have,
No worse them take than I have meant;
That after they be laid in grave,
Their souls may joy their lives well spent!
God grant believe that you may see
Upon my head such hairs to be!

John Heywood.

DIED CIRC. A. D. 1565.

THE progress of English dramatic literature affords a subject which merits the closest consideration: the historian and the philosopher are alike interested in its examination, and it may be regarded as furnishing one of the best indices that literature can afford, both of the manners and opinions of successive generations. It is this circumstance which has given some degree of importance to the name of John Heywood, who is generally allowed to have been the first writer of dramas, the subjects of which were not drawn from Scripture. As might be expected, they exhibit all the rudeness of first attempts, while the want of genius in the author appears both in the insipidity of their plots, and the cold puerilities of the dialogue. The period of Heywood's birth is unknown, but he was a native of Worth-mines near Saint Alban's in Hertfordshire, and studied some time at Oxford. On his return from the university—where his love of frolic appears to have been an effectual bar to his advancement in scholarship—he had the good fortune to acquire the notice of Sir Thomas More, whose residence in the neighbourhood of Saint Alban's was the favourite resort of the wits of the day. Through Sir Thomas he became known to Henry VIII., and in a short time won the good opinion of the monarch, not only by his pleasantries, but by his great skill in music. At what time he began to write plays is not stated, but it is a curious fact, that the first three on the list contain satires on the clergy, who, it will be recollected, were till now the chief masters of the drama. 'A play between Johan the husband, Tyb the wife, and Sir Johan the priest,

is the title of one: 'A merry play between the Pardoner and the Frere, the Curate and Neybour Pratte,' is that of another: while the third is named 'The play called the four P's. a new and a very merry Interlude of a Palmer, a Pardoner, a Potycary, a Pedlar.' It is not impossible but that Henry might have some share in instigating the wit to these sarcasms on that class of men whom he had so many reasons in the latter years of his reign to aim at humbling. His successor, different as he was in disposition to his father, continued to treat Heywood with regard; but on the accession of Mary to the throne, he became not merely a favourite at court, but an attendant on the private hours of her majesty, when the cares of royalty and her own melancholy disposition involved her in the most gloomy reflections. He had possessed her countenance at an early period of his life, but she was now in a situation to reward him highly for his devotion to her amusement, and such was the pleasure she took in his humorous conversation, that even in her last illness he frequently was admitted to her chamber. Some specimens of his wit have been preserved, and the following is given by Puttenham in his *Art of Poetry*, but the story, it is probable, loses something of its spirit in the telling: "Some speech" says Puttenham, "may be when it is spoken, very undecent, yet the same having something added to it, may be more pretty and decent, as happened on a time at the duke of Northumberland's board, where merry John Heywood was allowed to sit at the table's end. The duke had a very noble and honourable mind always to pay his debts well, and when he lacked money, would not stick to sell the greatest part of his plate: so he had done a few days before. Heywood being loath to call for his drink so oft as he was dry, turned his eye toward the cupboard, and said, 'I find great miss of your Grace's standing cups.' The duke thinking he had spoken it of some knowledge that his plate was lately sold, said somewhat sharply, 'Why, sir, will not those cups serve as good a man as yourself?' Heywood readily replied, 'Yes, if it please your Grace; but I would have one of them stand still at my elbow, full of drink, that I might not be driven to trouble your man so often to call for it.' This pleasant and speedy reverse of the former words holpe all the matter again; whereupon the duke became very pleasant, and drank a bottle of wine to Heywood, and bid a cup should always be standing by him."

The death of Queen Mary placed Heywood in a situation which seemed to him fraught with dangers. There is too much reason to fear that, bigotted as he is said to have been in his religion, he took as great a share as a wit and jester could take, in heaping odium on the persecuted protestants, and hardening the hearts of their enemies against the appeals of mercy. With the dread natural to conscious injustice even in its meanest instruments, he immediately prepared to quit the country, and fled with his family to Mechlin in Brabant. How long he lived after his retreat to the continent is unknown, the date of his death, like that of his birth, having escaped the inquiries of his biographers. A conjecture, however, has been formed that he lived to be old, from the circumstance, that he is known to have been still alive when one of his sons was thirty years of age. With regard to his character as a man of letters, he can scarcely be said to have exercised any great influence on the literature of his day. That he wrote plays

which were unconnected with the mysteries of religion is true; but this was rather owing to his love of jest, and the readiness with which jests and sarcasms will be listened to in any form, than to his good taste, or a perception of the proper sphere of the drama. His productions were among the earliest results of that increasing good sense which pervaded the nation; but they had not sufficient merit in themselves to be taken as examples, nor had the author sufficient vigour of mind or thought to sow the seeds of a new literature. The work in which the character of his mind, perhaps, may be best discovered, is the collection of epigrams which he wrote on the most common proverbs of the country. Some of these exhibit considerable ingenuity, and no lack of that species of wit which is easiest ripened by a knowledge of the world: the reader will be able to understand the nature of these compositions from the following:

Into a beggar's hand, that alms did crave,
Instead of one penny, two pence one gave,
Which done, he said, Beggar, happy thou art,
For to thee my hand is better than my heart.
That is (quoth the beggar) as it chanceth now,
The better for me, and the worse for yow.

The next is on another well known phrase:

'It is mery in hall when beardes wagge all.'
Husband, for this these wordes to mind I call;
This is meant by men in their merri eatinge,
Not to wag their beardes in brawling or threatinge:
Wyfe! the meaning hereof differeth not two pinnes,
Betweene wagginge of men's beardes and women's chinnes.

The following is of a graver nature:

Where will is good, and wit is yll,
There wisdome can no manner skyll.
Where wit is good, and will is yll,
There wisdome sitteth all silent still.
Where wit and will are both two ill,
There wisdome no way meddle will.
Where wit and will well ordered be,
There wisdome maketh a trinitee.

Some of the epigrams are much longer; and his 'Dialogue' on the 'Effectual Proverbs in the English tongue,' is regularly divided into chapters. Beside his plays and the work now mentioned, he wrote another called 'A Parable of the Spider and the Fly.' Of this poem, Harrison in Holinshed's chronicle, ungraciously remarks: "One also hath made a booke of the Spider and the Flie, wherein he dealeth so profoundlie, and beyond all measure of skill, that neither he himselfe that made it, neither aine one that readeth it, can reach unto the meaning thereof." Modern critics have not endeavoured to reverse this sentence, and Warton observes that perhaps, "there never was so dull, so tedious, and trifling an apologue; without fancy, meaning, or moral;" and that the author "seems to have intended a fable on the burlesque construction; but we know not when he would be serious and when witty, whether he means to make the reader laugh, or to give him advice." The work, in fact, was forgotten at a very early period, and Heywood's fame, even among the curious, rests solely on his epigrams.

Roger Ascham.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1515.—DIED A. D. 1568.

ROGER ASCHAM was born at Kirkby-Wiske, a village near Northallerton in Yorkshire, about the year 1515. His father, John Ascham, was house-steward in the noble family of Seroop; his mother, Margaret, was allied to several considerable families. These two good people are said to have lived together in harmony and affection for the long period of sixty-seven years, and to have at last died on the same hour of the same day. Roger, the third son of this worthy pair, while yet a youth, was received into the family of Sir Anthony Wingfield, and enjoyed, with that gentleman's sons, the benefit of private education under a domestic tutor. Discovering an early fondness for reading, and having made rapid progress in classical learning, his generous patron, pleased with the proofs which his young *élève* gave of genius and docility, determined to afford him the advantage of an university-education; and, in 1530, sent him to St John's college, Cambridge.

With the peculiar talents for the study of languages which Ascham possessed, it was fortunate for him that he entered upon life at a period when the attention of the whole educated world was turned towards the revival and advancement of learning, in connexion with the rapid progress of the art of printing, and Greek and Roman authors were edited with diligence, and read and studied with avidity throughout the republic of letters. The college in which young Ascham was entered, had caught the spirit of the age. Dr Metcalf, the master, was, as Ascham himself informs us, "a man meanly learned himself, but not meanly affectioned to set forward learning in others; and," he adds, "I lacked not his favour to further me in learning." Hugh Fitzherbert, his tutor, was a good scholar, and possessed a happy facility of teaching; and his friend Pemberton, who was ready on all occasions to assist him in his studies, was a great proficient in Greek learning. Ascham, from his entrance upon academic life, felt an ardent desire to excel in learning, and devoted himself with uncommon industry to his studies. According to the maxim, "*Qui docet, discit*," he thought that a language might be best learned by teaching it; and, as soon as he had made some progress in Greek, he undertook to instruct boys in the rudiments of that language. In his reading, he observed a rule well worth the attention of students, to "lose no time in the perusal of mean or unprofitable books." Cicero and Caesar, in particular, he studied as his best guides in writing the Latin language, and he formed his style upon these excellent models. In the 18th year of his age, Ascham took his first degree of A.B., and was, about a month afterwards, chosen fellow of the college. Notwithstanding his uncommon merit, his election to the fellowship was attended with some difficulty, on account of the favourable disposition which he had discovered towards the reformed religion. "Being a boy, new bachelor in arts," says he, "I chanced among my companions to speak against the pope, which matter was then in every man's mouth. * * * * My talk came to Dr Metcalf's ear—I was called before him and the seniors, and after grievous rebuke and

some punishment, open warning was given to all the fellows; 'none to be so hardy to give me his vote at that election.' And yet, for all those open threats, the good father himself privily procured that I should even then be chosen fellow." At the age of 21, in the year 1537, he was inaugurated A. M., and from this time, and perhaps sooner, publicly took upon him the office of tutor.

The high reputation which he had already acquired in Greek learning, and the recommendations of his friend Pemberton, brought the young tutor many pupils, several of whom proved eminent scholars, and rose to great eminence. Among the rest, William Grindal was so much distinguished, that, on the recommendation of Sir John Cheke, he was appointed master of languages to the princess Elizabeth. How it happened that Ascham himself was not nominated to this honourable post is not certain; but from one of his letters, it seems probable that he was at that time too fond of an academical life to exchange it for a station at court. Though no regular lectureship in Greek had yet been established at Oxford, Ascham was appointed to read public lectures on that language in the schools, for which he received a liberal salary from the university. At this time, a controversy existed in the university concerning the right pronunciation of the Greek language, in which Ascham at first opposed the method introduced by Sir John Cheke and Sir Thomas Smith, but afterwards, upon giving the matter a fuller examination, came over to their opinion and practice. It is probable that it is in part owing to the ingenuity with which he defended it, (see his letter to Hubertus Languetus,) that this mode of pronunciation was generally adopted, and has since prevailed in the schools of England.

Among the amusements with which Ascham enlivened his hours of leisure was that of instrumental music. He was also an accomplished penman, and often amused himself in his study by embellishing the pages of his manuscripts, according to the custom of the age, with elegant draughts and illuminations. In the open air he frequently exercised his body and relieved his mind from fatigue by the diversion of archery. His love of this exercise led him to compose a treatise on the art, which he entitled, 'Toxophilus.' This ingenious treatise, though, as a book of precepts, perhaps of little value, might, at the time when it was written, materially contribute to the improvement of the English language; for it was well adapted to answer the author's intention, expressed in a letter to Bishop Gardiner, of introducing in English prose a more natural, easy, and truly English diction, than was then in common use. Ascham has the honesty to confess, that another more selfish motive had a considerable share in producing this treatise. He wished to make a tour into Italy, at this time the capital of the republic of letters, and particularly the chief seat of Greek learning; and he hoped, by dedicating his book to the king, to obtain a pension which might enable him to accomplish this favourite design. It may reflect a small ray of honour on the name of Henry VIII., that this modest wish of the learned Ascham was not altogether frustrated. The king, in the year 1544, settled upon him an annual pension of £10;—a sum which Dr Johnson, reckoning together the wants which this sum would enable Ascham to supply, and the wants from which, by the general habits of the times, and the peculiar habits of a student's

life, he was exempt, estimates at more than one hundred pounds in the present day. This pension was for some time discontinued after the king's death, but was restored by Edward VI., and doubled by Queen Mary. Ascham, also, the same year, received the pecuniary benefit, as well as the honour of an appointment to the office of orator to the university—an office which, while he remained in the university, he filled with great credit.

The name of Ascham had now, by means of his pupils and writings, acquired considerable celebrity. At length, in 1548, upon the death of his pupil Grindal, preceptor to the Lady Elizabeth, that princess, to whom he had already given lessons in writing, called Ascham from his college to direct her studies. He accepted the honourable charge, and instructed his pupil in the learned languages with great diligence and success. He read with her the greater part of Cicero and Livy, the select orations of Socrates, the plays of Sophocles, and the Greek Testament; but after two years, some unknown cause of dissatisfaction arose, which led Ascham to take an abrupt leave of the princess, and return to the university. This circumstance did not, however, alienate her regard for her preceptor; for, in the same year, 1550, after visiting his native place and his old acquaintance in Yorkshire, he was recalled to the court and appointed secretary to Sir Richard Morisine, who was then going as ambassador to the emperor, Charles V. On his return to London, he paid a visit to Lady Jane Grey, to whom he acknowledges himself exceedingly beholden, and of whom he relates that he found her, while the duke and duchess, with the rest of the household, were hunting in the park, reading in her chamber Plato's *Phædo* in Greek, 'and that,' says he, 'with as much delight as some gentlemen would read a merry tale in Boccace.'

During his foreign expedition, which lasted three years, he travelled through a great part of Germany, and visited many learned men. When he was with the ambassador, he was useful to him, both in his private studies and the management of his public concerns. On three days in the week, he read with him in the morning some pages of Herodotus or Demosthenes, and in the afternoon a portion of Sophocles or Euripides. On the other days he wrote the letters of public business, and at night continued his diary, or remarks, and wrote private letters. One of the fruits of this tour was a curious and now scarce tract, entitled, 'A Report and Discourse of the Affairs and State of Germany,' &c., which contains valuable information and judicious reflections. It bears no date, but was probably written in 1532. Ascham made a short excursion into Italy, but was much disgusted with the manners of the inhabitants, particularly of the Venetians.

On the death of Edward VI., in 1553, Morisine was recalled, and Ascham returned to his college with no other support than his fellowship, and his salary as orator to the university. Through the interest of Lord Paget and of Bishop Gardiner, who, though he well knew that Ascham was a protestant, had the generosity not to desert him, he was appointed Latin secretary to the queen, with a salary of £10 a year, and permission to keep his college preferment. If it be thought surprising that he met with such good fortune under the intolerant reign of Mary, let it not be imputed to any servile compliance on his part.

Ascham was prudent, but not dishonest. He maintained his interest with Elizabeth in the most perilous times; and to the fidelity of his friendship with Cecil, he in part owed his prosperity under the next reign. The fact probably was, that besides the respect paid by all parties to Ascham for his learning, the facility and elegance of his Latin pen rendered him, in some sort, necessary at court. It is a striking instance of uncommon readiness and assiduity, that, in his capacity of Latin secretary, he wrote, in three days, forty-seven despatches to foreign personages of the highest rank, on the subject of electing Cardinal Pole to the papal chair. Among his own foreign correspondents were Sturmius of Strasburg, Osorius, Nannius of Louvain, and Jerom Wolfius. In 1554 he resigned his fellowship, and married Miss Margaret Howe, a young lady of good family.

The transmission of the crown from a popish to a protestant princess made little change in the situation of Ascham. He had been protected and favoured by Mary; and, upon the accession of Elizabeth, he was continued in his former employments with the same salary. He was, indeed, daily admitted to the presence of the queen, and read with her in the learned languages some hours every day; and of her proficiency under so excellent a master many proofs remain. We shall select one testimony from Ascham himself,—“Point forth six of the best given gentlemen of this court, and all they together show not so much good will, spend not so much time, bestow not so many hours daily, orderly, and constantly, for the increase of learning and knowledge, as doth the queen’s majesty herself. Yea, I believe that, beside her perfect readiness in Latin, Italian, French, and Spanish, she readeth here more Greek every day than some prebendary of this church doth read Latin in a whole week. And, that which is most praiseworthy of all, within the walls of her privy-chamber she hath obtained that excellence of learning, to understand, speak, and write, both wittily with head and fair with hand, as scarcely one or two wits in both universities have in many years reached unto.” For the master who taught his sovereign with so much success, and who was sometimes permitted to play with her at draughts and chess, a recompense might have been expected more worthy of royal munificence than a pension of £20 a-year, and the prebend of Westwang in the church of York; yet, through the queen’s parsimony, Ascham remained thus pitifully provided for till his death. It has been suggested that the queen kept him poor because she knew him to be extravagant; and he is accused, not unjustly it would appear, of a propensity disgraceful to a man of letters and humanity,—a fondness for dice and for cock-fighting. In his ‘Schoolmaster,’ Ascham intimates an intention of writing a book ‘Of the Cockpit,’ which he reckons among the kinds of pastime fit for a gentleman.

In the year 1563, a conversation arose in the apartment of the secretary, Sir William Cecil, at Windsor, on the subject of education. Some Eton scholars having that morning run away from the school for fear of chastisement, the discourse turned upon the severity of the correction used in the public schools. Contrary opinions were maintained upon the subject. Sir Richard Sackville, one of the company, was silent, but was so struck with the arguments of Ascham, in favour of a mild treatment of boys, that he afterwards entreated his advice and assistance in the education of his grandson, and, at the same time, requested that he

would compose a treatise on the general subject of education. These circumstances gave birth to an excellent performance, entitled, 'The Schoolmaster.' The work is strongly expressive of the author's humanity and good sense, and abounds with proofs of extensive and accurate erudition. It contains excellent practical advice, particularly on the method of teaching classical learning. This treatise was published after the author's death by his widow, in 1571, and was reprinted with notes, in 8vo., at London, by Upton, in 1711. His last illness was occasioned by too close application to the composition of a poem, which he meant to present to the queen on the New-year's-day of 1569. He died in his fifty-third year, on the 23d, or, according to some, the 30th of December, 1568, and was interred in St Sepulchre's church. His funeral sermon was preached by Dr Alex. Nowel, dean of St Paul's. His character is well drawn by Buchanan, in the following epigram, which he consecrated to the memory of his friend :—

Aschamum extinctum patriæ Græcæque camenæ,
Et Latitiæ vera cum pretate dolent.
Principibus vixit carus, jucundus amicis,
Re modica ; in mores dicere fama nequit.

The epistles of Ascham were published after his death by the master of Westminster school, and soon passed through four editions at home, and three abroad. The last and best edition is that by Elstob, Oxford, 1763. An edition of his works, with a life by Dr Johnson, was published by Bennet, in 4to., in 1761.¹

Walter Haddon, LL.D.

BORN A. D. 1516.—DIED A. D. 1572.

THIS most distinguished and elegant scholar, one of the brightest lay ornaments of the Reformation, was born of a respectable family in Buckinghamshire, in the year 1516. He was educated first at Eton, under Dr Cox, bishop of Ely, and, in 1533, was elected scholar of King's college, Cambridge, and was afterwards made fellow. He stood high among scholars, for the purity of his Latin style, and was considered a proficient both in oratory and poetry. Queen Elizabeth was once asked which she preferred, Buchanan or Haddon? Her reply was, "Buchannum omnibus antepono ; Haddonum nemini postpono." At the university he was accounted one of its brightest ornaments, and scarcely inferior in eloquence and Latinity to Cicero himself. His chief pursuit, however, was civil law, in which he took his degree, and was made public lecturer. He held also the professorship of rhetoric and oratory. During the short reign of Edward the Sixth, he was made master of Trinity, in the room of Bishop Gardiner. The office of vice-chancellor was conferred upon him in 1550, and, two years after, though not qualified for the office according to the statutes, he was chosen president of Magdalen college, Oxford. On the accession of Queen Mary, he withdrew from his public offices and retired into private life. The perils of that agitated and gloomy period he escaped,

¹ Aikin's Biog. Dict.—Biog. Brit.—Grant's Oration.—Bayle.

through the privacy which he sought; but, upon the death of Mary, he again appeared under the sanction of royal favour, and became one of the most distinguished ornaments of his country, under the patronage of Elizabeth. By her he was made master of requests, and was appointed, by Archbishop Parker, judge of the prerogative court of Canterbury. By the queen he was also employed on several embassies, and was made a commissioner at the royal visitation of the university of Cambridge. In 1565 and 1566, he was appointed, with Dr Walton, agent at Bruges, for restoring the ancient commerce between England and the Netherlands. He was esteemed an eminent lawyer, and had fair prospects of the highest promotion; but it is said he was always exceedingly reserved on the point of the succession, for though the earl of Leicester frequently solicited his opinion, it always remained locked in his own breast. He died in 1572, in the 56th year of his age. He was principally concerned in drawing up and putting¹ into Latin the code of ecclesiastical law, entitled '*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*,' edited by John Fox in 1571. In 1563, he published a reply to Jerome Osorio's letter, entitled, '*Admonitio ad Elizabetham Reginam Angliæ*.' His other works were collected and published by Thomas Hacker of King's college, Cambridge, under the title of '*Lucubrationes G. Haddoni*,' 4to. 1567; all Latin, and consisting mostly of orations, poems, and letters, on various subjects. Several of his original letters are preserved in the Harleian MSS.

John Caius, M.D.

BORN A. D. 1510.—DIED A. D. 1573.

THIS eminent physician was born at Norwich, October 6th, 1510. He received his elementary education in that city, and, in September, 1529, was sent to Gonville hall, in Cambridge. He appears to have distinguished himself there by literary labours of different kinds; in due course he received the degrees of bachelor and master in arts, and, in 1533, he was appointed to a fellowship. Six years afterwards, he travelled in France, Flanders, and Germany, and went to Padua, in order to complete his professional education. He studied there under Montanus, along with the celebrated anatomist, Vesalius. He graduated in medicine either in Padua or Bologna, after which, in 1542, he assisted Realdus Columbus in giving lectures on the Greek text of Aristotle, in the former university. In 1543, he travelled through Italy; after which, on his return to England, in the following year, taking his medical degree in Cambridge, he commenced the practice of medicine in Shrewsbury and Norwich. He did not remain long there, for we find him soon after giving anatomical demonstrations before the college of surgeons in London, which was followed by his appointment as physician to Edward VI. In this honourable office he continued under Mary and Elizabeth, till 1568, when his dismissal is said to have arisen from a suspicion that he was attached to the popish religion. He became a fellow of the college of physicians in 1547, and held several honourable offices in that body, of which he was president for seven years. He supported the college against all attacks,

and in particular, in a dispute between it and the college of surgeons, relative to the authority of the latter to employ internal remedies in the treatment of certain diseases. The first annals of the college were written by him, and extend from 1555 to 1572. In the reign of Mary, he received permission to endow Gonville hall, in Cambridge, which was erected into a college with the names of Gonville and Caius. He added to the funds of the college estates sufficient to maintain three fellows and twenty scholars. In 1559, he was made master of Gonville and Caius; and, six years afterwards, resigning his post as president of the college of physicians, he came down to the university to superintend the erection of new buildings in his college. He now resided entirely in Cambridge; and, on resigning the mastership of his college, he continued, as a fellow-commoner, to attend the chapel daily and assist at prayers. In this retirement he kept up his literary pursuits, and published many works, besides composing much which continues in MS. According to Mouffet's 'Health's Improvement,' he was reduced to a state of great debility before his death, and endeavoured to sustain his strength by the food of infancy. His death took place on the 19th of July, 1573, in the 63d year of his age. He lies in the chapel of his own college, where a monument is erected to his memory, with the simple inscription,—FUI CAIUS.

His name is recorded in a more substantial manner in the name of the college which his munificence enriched, and in the works of learning which he has left behind. During his residence in Italy, his first work appeared, consisting of a learned commentary on the treatise, 'De administrationibus Anatomicis,' attributed to Galen, and on that of the same author, entitled, 'De motu Musculorum.' This appeared at Basil, in 1544. His researches into the libraries of Italy enabled him to restore a treatise by Hippocrates, 'De Anatomia,' and to publish one which had hitherto existed only in manuscript, 'De Medicamentis.' Of other critical works he wrote a treatise on the consonance of the English with the Greek and Latin languages; and various annotations on Celsus which were never published. He wrote a system of medicine entitled, 'De Methodo medendi,' which appeared at Basil in 1544. Another medical work, the only one of his which appeared in English, was printed in 1552. It is entitled, 'A Booke, or Counsell against the disease, commonly called the Sweate or Sweatyng Sickness. Made by Ihon Caius, doctor in Phisicke, &c.' This disease made its appearance at the time when Dr Caius practised at Shrewsbury, and his description is the best that is extant. He calls it a "contagious pestilential fever of one day"—and describes it as prevailing "with a mighty slaughter, and the description of it as tremendous as the plague of Athens." The practice of medicine was not then so far advanced as to render this work of much value in a practical point of view, but it displays deep learning. As a naturalist, Caius was very well informed. Some of his papers were inserted in the works of the celebrated Gesner, and afterwards appeared in a separate form in London, 1570. He was induced by Gesner to write a treatise on British dogs, in 1570. The arrangement which he followed has been adopted by Mr Pennant in his British Zoology. As an antiquarian, Caius distinguished himself on several occasions. Besides the extensive research exhibited by almost all his works, we have proof of his ingenuity in a vindication of

Cambridge, entitled 'De Antiquitate Cantabrigiæ academiciæ.' One Key, or Caius, of All Souls college, Oxford, had asserted the superior antiquity of that university over that of Cambridge. This was answered by the work of Caius above mentioned, wherein, by much ingenious reasoning, he fixes the origin of the university of Cambridge at a period of 394 years before Christ! The works of Dr Caius, both published and in MS. are enumerated in a book which he published in 1570, entitled 'De Libris propriis.' Respecting the private character of Caius, little is known. He appears to have been of a studious disposition; and we may judge of his liberality of feeling from his munificence to his Alma mater.

Raphael Holinshed.

BORN CIR. A. D. 1520.—DIED A. D. 1580.

OF this useful and industrious writer, who has rescued many illustrious persons and facts from oblivion, there is but little account transmitted to posterity. We are informed that he was descended from a family of the same name at Bosely in Cheshire. Bishop Tanner says that he was educated in Cambridge, where he commenced master of arts in 1544. If so, we may conjecture that he was born about the year 1520. It has been thought that he was educated as a clergyman, and exercised the ministry; but this opinion seems to be confuted by the expressions in his will, of which the following is a copy, as given by Mr Hearne, in his preface to Camden's annals:—

"In the name of God, amen. I, Raphael Hollynshed of Bromecote, in the county of Warwick, ordaine and make my last will and testament in manner and form following:—*First*, I bequeath my sinful soule to almighty God, the creator of me and all mankind, trusting that, by the merits and blood-shedding of his dearest Son, Jesus Christ, he will pardon me of all my offences, and place my said sinfull soule, washed and purged from the filth of sin, among the number of his elect in the bliss of heaven. *Secondly*, for my worldly goods, whatsoever the same be, wherein I have any property to give and bestow the same, I give and bequeath them, and every part and parcel of them unto my master, Thomas Burdett of Bromcote, aforesaid, Esq., making and constituting him my only and sole executor. In witness whereof I have written my last will and testament with mine own hand, and subscribed my name, and put to my seale, the first day of October, in the year of our Lord God, a thousand five hundred, seventy-eight.

"PER ME RAPHAEL HOLLYNSHED.

"Proved April 24th, 1582."

From this document, and from his literary labours, must be gathered the most that can be known of the chronicler. From these sources we learn, that though he might not have received a university education, he was a man of competent learning, and possessed of all the qualities of a diligent and faithful historian; that he was held in high estimation by the learned antiquaries of his day, with some of whom he was as-

sociated in his works; that his life was divided between these useful labours and the faithful discharge of his duties as steward to the estate of the gentleman named in his will, and to whom he bequeathed all his worldly goods; and that he lived and died in the faith of a true protestant. This is substantially the life and character of Ralph Holinshed, and it is sufficient to commend him as a good man, and a worthy member of society, who lived rather for the benefit of posterity than for any sordid, personal ends.

The following is an account of the voluminous chronicles of Holinshed, in which work he was assisted by William Harrison, a beneficed clergyman of Kent, John Hooker, alias Vowell of Exeter, gent., uncle to the celebrated Richard Hooker, and a considerable antiquary, and Abraham Fleming, rector of St Pancras, London. "Vol. I. contains an Historical Description of the Iland of Britaine, in three books, by William Harrison: next, the Historie of England, from the time that it was first inhabited, untill the time that it was last conquered; by R. Holinshed. Vol. II. contains the description, conquest, inhabitation, and troublesome estate of Ireland; particularly the description of that kingdom, compiled by Richard Stanihurst. The conquest of Ireland translated from the Latin of Giraldus Cambrensis, by John Hooker, alias Vowell, of Exeter, gent. The chronicles of Ireland beginning where Giraldus did end, continued until the year 1509, from Philip Flatsburie, Henrie of Marleborow, Edm. Campian, &c.; by R. Hollynshed, and from thence to the year 1586, by R. Stanihurst and J. Hooker. The Description of Scotland, translated from the Latin of Hector Boethius, by R. H. or W. H. The Historie of Scotland, containing the beginning, increase, proceedings, continuance, acts, and government of the Scottish nation, from the originall thereof unto the yeere 1571, gathered by Raphael Holinshed, and continued from 1571 to 1586, by Francis Boteville, alias Thin, and others. Vol. iii. begins at Duke William the Norman, commonlie called the Conqueror, and descends by degrees of yeeres to all the kings and queenes of England. First compiled by Raphael Holinshed, and by him extended to the yeare 1577; augmented and continued to the yeare 1586, by John Stow, Francis Thin, Abraham Fleming, and others."

In the second edition of the Chronicles, several sheets were castrated in the second and third volumes, chiefly of Thin's additions, because there were passages in them disagreeable to Queen Elizabeth and her ministry. These castrations were made by order of the privy council. They are, however, published separately, under the name of 'Castrations to Holinshed's Chronicle.' In the late reprint of the series of English Chronicles by the booksellers of London, Holinshed took the precedence, and was accurately edited in six volumes, 4to.

The time of Holinshed's death is not exactly known; but it appears from his will, that it was between the first day of October, 1578, and the twenty-fourth of April, 1582. Bishop Tauner says he died at Bromcote, in 1580.

Sir Philip Sidney.

BORN A. D. 1554.—DIED A. D. 1586.

THIS bright ‘ornament of his country’ was born at Penshurst in Kent, on the 29th of November, 1554. On the mother’s side he was descended from the famous Dudleys, dukes of Northumberland; his father, though sprung from a less splendid source, was yet the representative of an old and respectable family, and, which is of more importance, was a man of rare talents and exalted virtues. Educated under his eye, and possessing so much inherent talent, the young Sidney’s youth gave bright promise of his manhood, and, according to the testimony of his friend and biographer Sir Fulke Greville, made all who knew him, look upon him as one who was destined to play no undistinguished part on the great stage of life. Having imbibed the rudiments of knowledge at Shrewsbury school, he went to Oxford in 1569, and subsequently to Cambridge, where he applied himself to exploring, not only the common track of literature, but also its more hidden recesses, with a vehemence and intensity, as unusual as it was honourable. “Such was his appetite for learning,” says Fuller, “that he could never be fed fast enough therewith, and so quick and strong his digestion, that he soon turned it into wholesome nourishment and thrived healthfully thereon.” After leaving the university he went abroad, not for the purpose of plunging into dissipation, or of amusing himself with new scenes; but to gain the acquaintance of learned men,—to make farther acquisitions to his literary store,—to enlarge his mind by contemplating foreign customs and manners,—to observe the form of government under which the people were happiest,—to inquire into the resources and policy of states,—and, in a word, so to expand his intellect, as to make him a worthy member of the first commonwealth in Europe. During his stay in Paris, the massacre of St Bartholomew deluged the French capital with blood, and covered the French name with eternal infamy. Sidney escaped in that night of crime by taking refuge in the house of the British ambassador, Sir Francis Walsingham, to whose care he had been recommended by his uncle, the famous earl of Leicester. From France he proceeded on his travels through Germany, Hungary, Italy and Belgium, diligently pursuing, wherever he came, all arts which it befitted a gentleman or scholar to know, and every where acquiring the love and admiration of those with whom he consorted. The most celebrated men of the day, disregarding his youth, admitted him to their intimacy. The two learned printers, Robert and Henry Stephens, Daniel Rogers, the poet Tasso, Zacharias Ursinus and others of almost equal eminence, honoured him with their friendship. One distinguished man, the justly-famous Hubert Languet, appears to have regarded him with an almost paternal affection, and by the excellent advice which he gave him, both orally and in frequent letters, contributed no little to confirm him in the bright path of honour and virtue on which he had already entered.

After an absence of three years, Sidney returned to England in May 1575.

——— “Complete in feature and in mind,
With all good grace to grace a gentleman.”

His varied learning, his refined manners and polished mind, speedily made him the pride and admiration of the English court, to which probably the singular beauty of his personal appearance conduced. “He was so essential,” says Fuller, “to the English court, that it seemed maimed without his company, being a complete master of matter and language.” The queen—than whom none was more skilled in choosing fit agents for her purposes—soon discerned his talents, and in 1576, sent him as ambassador, ostensibly to condole with the Emperor Rodolph on the demise of his father Maximilian the II., and on a similar mission to John Casimir, count-palatine of the Rhine, whose father also was lately deceased. The real object of these embassies, was to consolidate a union of all the protestant states, against their common foe the catholic powers, in which Sidney succeeded. He had also the good fortune to acquire the friendship, not only of the potentates to whom he was sent as ambassador, but likewise of the illustrious William Prince of Orange, “one of the ripest and greatest counsellors at that day in Europe.” Different as were these two eminent men in station, they were of kindred mind, and their friendship appears to have been as warm and sincere as could have existed between equals. On Sidney’s return to England, he was highly applauded for the conduct of his embassies. “There hath not been any gentleman, I am sure, these many yeres,” writes Sir John Walsingham to Sidney’s father, “that hath gon through so honorable a charge with as great commendacions as he.” For some time after his return he continued at court, diligently performing all the duties of a good son and a good subject, though, as may be inferred from Languet’s letters, the life of a courtier had few charms for him. When the marriage between the queen and the duke of Anjou was in agitation, Sidney with memorable patriotism, wrote a long letter to the queen, in which he set forth, though at great risk of incurring her displeasure, many strong reasons against the match. This letter which is still extant, was distinguished not less by the force of its argument than by the beauty of its style, and, as Strype thinks, had considerable influence in swaying the queen’s mind against the marriage.

About this time he got involved in a quarrel with the earl of Oxford, in consequence of which he retired from the court for a short time to Wilton, a beautiful seat belonging to his brother-in-law, the earl of Pembroke. It was here that he is supposed to have written his ‘Arcadia.’ This singular romance, being intended merely for the amusement of his sister, the countess of Pembroke, was composed on detached sheets of paper at different intervals, and each sheet was sent to the countess as soon as it was filled. She, who tenderly loved her brother, treasured up the manuscripts carefully, and some years after his death allowed them to be printed, contrary, it is said, to his dying wish.

Of the estimation in which Sidney was held, not only in England, but throughout Europe, it is no small proof that, young as he was, his assistance was personally requested in 1579, by one of the candidates for the crown of Portugal. Sidney would have complied with the request, had not the queen, who held his safety very dear, forbidden him. The queen also prevented him from embarking in an expedition which,

in conjunction with Sir Francis Drake, he had planned, to make an attack on the Spanish settlements in America. In 1583, he married a daughter of Sir Francis Walsingham, a lady of extraordinary worth and beauty, and in the same year he received from Elizabeth the honour of knighthood. Not long afterwards, at the request of some distinguished foreigners, he became a candidate for the crown of Poland, at that time vacant, and it has been thought by many that he would have been elected, had not the queen once again opposed his wishes: "refusing," says Sir Robert Naunton, "to further his advancement, not out of emulation, but out of fear to lose the jewel of her times." What effect Sidney's exalted character and commanding talents might have had in altering the destinies of that ill-starred country, had he been raised to the throne, it were fruitless to inquire.

We are now approaching the closing scene of Sidney's life. In 1585, the protestant inhabitants of the Netherlands, unable longer to endure the barbarities of the duke of Alva, besought the assistance of Elizabeth, and on condition of her sending troops to their aid, ceded to her certain of their towns. Of these towns, Flushing was the most important, to the government of which Elizabeth appointed Sidney, resolving at length to gratify the enterprising spirit she had so often curbed. Sidney, both from anxiety to distinguish himself, and from an ardent and honourable desire to fight in the cause of religious liberty, eagerly accepted the command, and although trammelled by the misconduct of his uncle, the earl of Leicester, who had been appointed captain-general of Holland, he yet contrived on several occasions to render signal service to the cause in which he was embarked. But the tree was to be cut down, even when its bloom was brightest. At the hard-fought battle of Zutphen, while he was conducting himself with an almost superhuman energy and courage, he received a wound, which at once incapacitated him for further exertion, and in a very short time after brought him to an untimely grave. "Sir Philip Sidney," says Stowe, "so behaved himself that it was wonder to see; for he charged the enemy thrice in one skirmish, and in the last charge he was shot through his left thigh, to the great grief of his excellency and the whole camp."¹ He languished for sixteen days in great pain and expired on the 19th of October, 1586, in the 32d year of his age. He displayed on his deathbed the same lofty character which had secured to him through life the love and admiration of mankind. The courage of a hero, the calmness of a philosopher, and above all, the genuine piety of a Christian, gilded the dying hours of this glorious martyr to the cause of civil and religious liberty. It is almost impossible for a modern to comprehend the universal burst of sorrow throughout Europe, when the news of his death was told. In England no gentleman for many months appeared in the city or court out of mourning; James, king of Scotland, honoured him with an epitaph; both the universities poured forth elegiac strains; Holland paid to her defender the tribute of her tears; and even the marble-hearted monster Philip of Spain, lamented his death. The States of Holland earnestly petitioned to be allowed to bury his ashes, but Elizabeth resolving herself to do honour to his

¹ The affecting anecdote which is told of Sir Philip's resigning to a dying soldier the water brought for himself, is too common to need repetition here.

remains, caused him to be interred with infinite ceremony and pomp, on the 16th of February following, in St Paul's cathedral.

In estimating Sir Philip Sidney's merits as a writer, it behoves us to remember, that his literary career was cut short at an age when that of most men is only commencing, and that the productions which he has left us were little more than the unpolished and uncared-for play things of his idle hours. His writings were not the set productions of an author—they were the holyday amusements of a gentleman. These circumstances being remembered, we are enabled readily to account for the occasional extravagancies and redundancies which mark his style, while our admiration is increased tenfold in the contemplation of the high original genius which beams from every page. His greatest work, the *Arcadia*, by which posterity has determined that his merits are to stand or fall, is one of those singular fictions in which were united the heroic and pastoral romance. Those acquainted with this species of writing, must know the difficulty of making it at all readable, and such persons will be best qualified to estimate the matchless ingenuity and talent with which Sidney has contrived to make the *Arcadia*, not only not absurd, but in many parts intensely interesting. It is nevertheless to be confessed, that the nature of the fiction is a great drawback on the pleasure of perusing it. The plot, indeed, is skilfully constructed, and the scenes are worked up with a power and command over the affections of the heart such as few writers exhibit, but, to counterbalance this, there are many anomalies, perhaps we should say absurdities, many unnatural events or actions, an air of such improbability pervading the book, that it is but rarely we can award to the author even the belief of our imaginations. These, however, are not so much the faults of the author as of the class which he selected. The *Arcadia* is therefore principally valuable for the exquisite beauty of many of the detached passages,—the flashes and outbreaks of a lofty mind whose mingled essence was poetry and honour. Much of the charm arises from our clearly perceiving, that the remarks,—the characters,—the poetic descriptions which adorn his page,—are not the laboured excogitations of a hackneyed writer, but the spontaneous effusions of a mind which poured forth its genuine feelings unchecked by the fear of criticism. With the joyous elasticity of youth and conscious talent, his fancy went bounding on through the fairy land which his imagination created, and wherever beauty, love, or honour bloomed the brightest, there he culled the choicest flowers. The inimitable beauty of many of the descriptions of nature,—the force and originality of the aphorisms,—the commanding intellect displayed in the occasional reasonings and reflections,—the high poetic genius and the indescribable air of lofty and chivalrous feeling which reigns throughout,—make the *Arcadia* a treasure to all whose taste is not thoroughly depraved. Horace Walpole has indeed called it a “lamentable, pedantic, pastoral romance, which the patience of a young virgin in love cannot now wade through;” but we apprehend that his censure will be heeded only by the few who are ignorant that Horace Walpole experienced, in attempting to overthrow every established opinion, a delight not unlike that which the Czar, Peter the Great, is said to have derived from being wheeled in a barrow through Evelyn's “glorious and impenetrable holly-bush” at Sayes court. Nor do we think that the censure of

the lord of Strawberry hill will suffice to condemn a book which has received the praise of Sir William Temple and John Milton.² At any rate, be its merits what they may, it is certain that that man can never have fed rightly of 'the dainties that are bred in books,' who does not award to Sidney's *Arcadia* an immeasurable superiority over Lord Orford's *Castle of Otranto*.

His 'Defence of Poesy' is a short treatise which has been hidden beneath the bulk of the *Arcadia*, though it would serve as a lasting monument to any writer. Like the celebrated work of Longinus, it is in itself a living testimony to the glory of the art whereof it treats. Sidney has contrived to interweave with, and make subservient to a train of powerful reasoning, passages of such beauty and splendour, that he who should doubt the majesty of 'sacred poesy,' with such witnesses before his eyes, would deserve, while he lived, "to live in love and never get favour, for lacking skill of a sonnet, and, when he died, that his memory should die from the earth for want of an epitaph."

Sidney's poetry is the portion of his works which will be read with the least pleasure. It is chiefly amatory, and, like most poetry of that nature, abounds in extravagant compliments, far-fetched conceits and protestations, very wearisome to any but the parties concerned. Occasionally there are ideas worthy of the author, and glittering passages, but they serve only to cast a stronger light on the barrenness by which they are surrounded.

It cannot be denied, that one great charm of Sir P. Sidney's writings arises from those mysterious laws of association which bring before us in every page the recollection of the author. We summon up in our imagination the peerless warrior,—the flower of the English court,—the pattern whom all desirous of eminence made it their object to imitate—the friend of liberty,—the "hope of all learned men, and patron of Spenser's young Muses;" while the bloody field on which that noble head was laid low rises dimly before us, and we turn to the glowing page, on which his thoughts yet live, with a melancholy and intense interest. Sidney flourished at a time when the manners and opinions of England, and indeed of Europe, were undergoing a mighty change, and it is no hyperbole to say that his character exhibited all the more pleasing features of the two eras. The dauntless courage,—the courtly grace,—the high-toned humanity, and the spotless honour which belonged to the ages of chivalry,—were mingled in his character, and well compounded with the love of literature,—the enlightened and cultivated mind,—the statesman-like talents, and the attachment to liberty and true religion, which are the more peculiar characteristics of civilization. Placed like a great sea-mark to denote this grand movement of the human race, he stands forth an enduring monument of all that is great and noble in the ages of romance as well as in those of history. The pen, from which trickled the honeyed sweetness of the *Arcadia*, was wielded, when occasion required, in an energetic and powerfully-reasoned appeal to his sovereign, in behalf of his country and religion; and the eye which shed joy and gladness over courtly festival and lady's bower, glanced calmly and fearlessly over the blood-gorged field of Zutphen. He was one, of whom it will not be extravagant to agree with Camden

² Milton in the *Iconoclastes* calls the *Arcadia* "a book full of mirth and witty."

in saying, that he is "his own monument whose memory is eternized in his writings, and who was born into the world to show unto our age a sample of ancient virtues;" or, with Spenser, in styling him that

"most noble spirit,
To whom all beauty and all vertuous love
Appeared in their native properties,
And did enrich that noble soul of his
With treasure passing all this worldes worth—
Worthy of heaven itself, which brought it forth."

His works were printed at London in 3 vols. octavo, 1724-5. There are two short pieces in the Somers' Tracts of which he is there called the author, but we know not on what authority. They are very like his style, however.

Thomas Cavendish.

DIED A. D. 1592.

IN nothing does the policy of Elizabeth appear more conspicuous than in the attention which was paid during her reign to the rising marine of the kingdom, and the encouragement which she uniformly tendered to those intrepid spirits who took the lead in maritime discovery amongst English seamen. The apostrophe of Purchas to the memory of 'glorious Elizabeth' is, however high wrought, not without a certain shade of truth, and may be quoted here both for the reader's edification and amusement. "Thou wast indeed," says Master Purchas, addressing the spirit of the 'English Deborah,' "Thou wast indeed the mother of English sea-greatness. And didst first by thy generals, not salute alone, but awe and terrify the remotest east and west,—stretching thy long and strong arms to India, to China, to America, to the Peruvian seas, the Californian coast, and New Albion's sceptres. Thou madest the northern Muscovite admire thy greatness. Thou gavest name to the north-west straits; and the southern Negroes, and islands of the south unknown continent which knew not humanity, were compelled to know thee. Thou embracedst the whole earthly globe in thy maritime arms. Thou freedest England from Easterlings and Lombard's borrowed legs; and taught her not only to stand and go without help, but to become help to out-friends, and with her own sea-forces to stand against, yea to stand upon, and stamp under her feet the proudest of her foes. Thou wast a mother to thy neighbours, Scots, French, Dutch,—a mirror to the remotest nations. Great Cumberland's twelve voyages before recited are thine, and the fiery vigour of his martial spirit was kindled at thy bright lamp, and quickened by the great spirit of Elizabeth. Drake, Cavendish, John and Richard Hawkins, Raleigh, Dudley, Shirley, Preston, Grenville, Lancaster, Wood, Raymond, Levison, Monson, Winter, Frobisher, Davis, and other star-worthies of England's sphere, whose planet-courses we have before related, all acknowledge Eliza's orb to be their first and highest mover."

One of the most illustrious of this group of 'star-worthies,' was Thomas Cavendish, the second Englishman that circumnavigated the globe; his paternal estates lying near Ipswich, he may have caught

his first predilections for nautical life from the scenes which he witnessed at that port. Of more art than prudence, he early dissipated his patrimony, which was considerable, in the amusements and gallantries of a man of fashion; but the riches of the Indian settlements and the exploits of Drake were now beginning to be talked about, and Cavendish resolved to peril the relics of his fortune in the attempt to emulate the exploits and success of that great man. In 1585, he accompanied Sir Richard Grenville's expedition to Virginia; and in July, 1586, he sailed from Plymouth with a small squadron of his own. His first exploit was a descent upon Sierra Leone in which he won neither honour nor booty. On the 16th of December, he made the coast of America in 47° 30' south latitude, and on the 6th of January, next year, he entered Magellan's straits; here he found the wretched remains of a Spanish colony founded after Drake's appearance in this quarter, by Sarmiento, with the view of retaining what was considered as the master-key to the South seas in the hands of Spain. These colonists had been long abandoned to their fate by the mother-country. Cavendish offered to transport them to Peru, but they hesitated to trust themselves to the heretic, and while they differed among themselves on the point, a fair wind springing up, the English squadron sailed, leaving the wretched Spaniards to their miserable fate. On the 24th of February, the squadron emerged from the straits after performing a number of marauding exploits on the Peruvian and Chilian coast. Cavendish, on the 4th of November, encountered the *Santa Anna*, a Spanish vessel of 700 tons, having 122,000 pesos in gold on board, with a rich cargo of silks and wine, which he took after a slight action. He arrived at Plymouth on the 9th of September, 1588, having completed the circumnavigation of the globe in two years and fifty days.

It may afford some insight into the spirit of the times and the views which men then took of the most wanton outrages on human life and property, when perpetrated upon the subjects of a country with which we are at war, to quote Cavendish's own summary of his exploits during this expedition as detailed by him in a letter to his friend and patron Lord Hunsdon. "It hath pleased almighty God," says our navigator, "to suffer me to circumpass the whole globe of the world, entering in at the strait of Magellan by the cape de Buena Esperança; in which voyage I have either discovered or brought certain intelligence of all the rich places of the world, which were ever discovered by any Christian. I navigated along the coast of Chili, Peru, and New Spain, where I made great spoils. I burnt and sunk nineteen sails of ships small and great. All the villages and towns that ever I landed at I burned and spoiled, and had I not been discovered upon the coast, I had taken great quantity of treasure. The matter of most profit unto me was a great ship of the king's which I took at California; which ship came from the Philippines, being one of the richest of merchandize that ever passed those seas.

"From the cape of California, being the uttermost part of New Spain, I navigated to the islands of the Philippines, hard upon the coast of China, of which country I have brought such intelligence as hath not been heard of in those parts: the stateliness and riches of which I fear to make report of lest I should not be credited. . . . I found out by the way homeward the island of Sancta Helena, where the Portu-

guese used to relieve themselves, and from that island God hath suffered me to return to England. All which services, with myself, I humbly prostrate at her majesty's feet, desiring the Almighty long to continue her reign among us; for at this day she is the most famous and virtuous princess that liveth in the world."

With the means of gratification his old habits had returned upon him, but Cavendish was less fortunate in his second voyage. Within three years after his arrival from his first cruise, he determined to put to sea again for the purpose of recruiting his exhausted finances. His ship the *Desire*, was on this occasion commanded by the celebrated navigator John Davis. They put to sea on the 26th of August, and on the 5th of December, they pillaged Placengia, a Portuguese settlement on the coast of Brazil. On the 14th of April, they entered the straits, but symptoms of dissatisfaction and mutinies had already shown themselves amongst the squadron, the weather became stormy, and Cavendish and Davis held different opinions as to the course to be pursued after clearing the straits. The majority of the crew also differed from both. In this emergency Cavendish agreed to return to Brazil for supplies, and then to attempt the trade again, and they accordingly shaped their course eastwards; but on the 20th of May, Davis in the *Desire*, was separated from the *Leicester* galleys in which Cavendish had embarked. It was certainly not the intention of Davis to desert his master, although Cavendish charges him with it. The ships had in fact lost sight of each other, and by a series of unfortunate circumstances which neither commander could control, were prevented rejoining. Cavendish soon afterwards lost all command of his crew, who insisted on returning to England, declaring that they could no longer peril their lives in his profitless service. With bitter reluctance he yielded to the necessity of his situation, but his proud spirit could not support the indignity thus put upon him, and before the *Leicester* came in sight of England, her gallant commander had expired.

Christopher Marlowe.

BORN CIR. A. D. 1562.—DIED CIR. A. D. 1593.

Mr ELLIS conjectures that this great dramatist was born about the year 1562. There is no account extant of his family. Baker informs us that he was of Bennet college, Cambridge; and that he took the degree of M. A. there in 1587. He came to a tragical and premature end about the year 1593. "It happened," says Wood, "that he fell deeply in love with a low girl, and had for his rival a fellow in livery, who looked more like a pimp than a lover. Marlowe, fired with jealousy, and having some reason to believe that his mistress granted the fellow favours, rushed upon him to stab him with his dagger; but the footman being quick, arrested the stroke, and catching hold of Marlowe's wrist, stabbed him with his own weapon, and notwithstanding all the assistance of the surgery, he soon after died of the wound, before the year 1593." This story occurs in Beard's '*Theatre of God's Judgments*,' and in a work, which probably preceded the *Theatre*, Vaughan's '*Golden Grove*.' Vaughan says that the

catastrophe happened at Deptford, and that the name of Marlowe's antagonist was Ingram. Aubrey fixes the murder on a rival poet, Ben Jonson. A Monthly reviewer has thrown out the suspicion that Christopher Marlowe is but a borrowed designation of the great Shakspeare, "who disappears from all biographical research just at the moment when Marlowe first comes on the stage, and who reappears in his proper name in 1592, when a strange story was put in circulation that Marlowe had been recently assassinated with his own sword, which may," says the reviewer, "be allegorically true." In support of this theory, the reviewer goes on to point out the habitual resemblance of style between these two writers; and notices the fact, that the name of Marlowe—as if being fictitious it were common property—was borrowed successively, after the pretended death of Marlowe, by several authors.¹ We think there is a refinement of scepticism in this theory of the identity of our two great dramatists. Judging from the internal evidence of their works alone, we are at a loss to conceive how any English critic should have come to the conclusion that Marlowe was only another name for the matchless Shakspeare. Not to count on any other points of difference, the want of unity and coherence so observable in all Marlowe's dramas, must for ever mark him out as one '*longo intervallo proximus*' to Shakspeare.

A serious accusation has been preferred against Marlowe, which seems to have originated with Beard, namely, that he was an atheist, and "not only in word blasphemed the Trinity, but also, as it was credibly reported, wrote divers discourses against it, affirming our Saviour to be a deceiver, and Moses to be a conjurer,—the Holy Bible to contain only idle stories, and all religions but a device of policy." Bishop Tanner calls him '*atheista et blasphemus horrendus*;' and Hawkens says of him, that "he was an excellent poet, but of abandoned morals, and of the most impious principles—a complete libertine, and an avowed atheist." All this rests, as we have observed, on the single authority of Beard, and he, after all, merely professes to make the statement upon hearsay! One is ready to ask where are the several blasphemous discourses which Marlowe penned? No one has seen them; and Greene, his intimate friend, when reproving him for his dissipated life, brings no such charge against him as Beard insinuates. No one can deny that Marlowe led a sensual and vicious life, but it is altogether unjust to accuse him of having penned a systematic attack upon the foundations of religion, without much better evidence than has yet been offered to substantiate so grave a charge.

Marlowe has written six plays; he also assisted Nash in his tragedy of '*Dido*,' and Day in the comedy of '*The Maiden's Holiday*,' which was never printed. The first and second, and part of the third sestiads of the poem of '*Hero and Leander*' are known to have been written by him; he also translated the first book of Lucan's '*Pharsalia*' into English blank verse, and the '*Elegies*' of Ovid. The licentiousness of the Ovidean muse was rendered by him with such fidelity that his book was condemned and burnt at Stationer's hall, in 1599, by order of the archbishop of Canterbury.

We have already alluded to the principal defect in Marlowe's dra-

¹ Monthly Rev., vol. xxiii, pp. 61-63.

matic writings,—their unskilful construction and the general want of coherence in their parts. Perhaps the most free from this defect of all his plays is that entitled 'Lust's Dominion.' But the best idea of Marlowe's powers, and also of his weaknesses, will be formed from his 'Faustus.' This play was always a favourite in those days, when witchcraft and magic were more implicitly believed in than now. It contains a good deal of low buffoonery and bombast, but has many passages of extraordinary power, and one scene in particular of tremendous interest, from which we must be allowed to quote rather fully :—

(The clock strikes eleven.)

Faust. Oh, Faustus!

Now hast thou but one bare hour to live,
And then thou must be damn'd perpetually.
Stand still, you ever-moving spheres of heav'n,
That time may cease, and midnight never come.
Fair nature's eye, rise, rise again, and make
Perpetual day; or let this hour be but a year,
A month, a week, a natural day,
The Faustus may repent, and save his soul.
O lente lente currite noctis equi!
The stars move still, time runs, the clock will strike,
The devil will come, and Faustus must be damn'd.
Oh, I'll leap up to heav'n!—Who pulls me down?
See where Christ's blood streams in the firmament:
One drop of blood will save me: oh, my Christ!
Rend not my heart for naming of my Christ;
Yet will I call on him. Oh, spare me, Lucifer!—
Where is it now?—'tis gone?
And see, a threatening arm, an angry brow.
Mountains and hills, come, come, and fall on me,
And hide me from the heavy wrath of heav'n!
No! Then will I headlong run into the earth:
Gape, earth!—O no, it will not harbour me.
Yon stars, that reigned at my nativity,
Whose influence hath allotted death and hell,
Now draw up Faustus, like a foggy mist,
Into the entrails of yon labouring cloud;
That, when you vomit forth into the air,
My limbs may issue from your smoky mouths;
But let my soul mount and ascend to heav'n.

(The watch strikes.)

Oh! half the hour is past: 'twill all be past anon.
Oh! if my soul must suffer for my sin,
Impose some end to my incessant pain.
Let Faustus live in hell a thousand years,
A hundred thousand, and at last be saved:
No end is limited to damned souls.
Why wert thou not a creature wanting soul?
Or why is this immortal that thou hast?
Ah! Pythagoras' metempsychosis! were that true,
This soul should fly from me, and I be chang'd
Into some brutish beast.
All beasts are happy, for when they die,
Their souls are soon dissolv'd in elements;
But mine must live still to be plagued in hell.
Curs'd be the parents that engendered me!
No, Faustus, curse thyself, curse Lucifer,
That hath depriv'd thee of the joys of heav'n.

(The clock strikes twelve.)

It strikes, it strikes! now, body, turn to air,
Or Lucifer will bear thee quick to hell.

O soul! be chang'd into small water-drops,
And fall into the ocean; ne'er be found.

(*Thunder.*) *Enter the Devils.*

Oh! mercy, heav'n, look not so fierce on me!
Adders and serpents, let me breathe awhile!
Ugly hell, gape not! Come not, Lucifer!—
I'll burn my books!—Oh, Mephistopholis!

[*Exeunt.*

Enter the Scholars.

"1st *Scho.* Come, gentlemen, let us go visit Faustus,
For such a dreadful night was never seen
Since first the world's creation did begin;
Such fearful shrieks and cries were never heard;
Pray heaven the doctor have escaped the danger!

2d *Scho.* Oh, help us, heavens! see, here are Faustus' limbs,
All torn asunder by the hand of death.

3d *Scho.* The devils who Faustus served have torn him thus;
For, 'twixt the hours of twelve and one, methought
I heard him shriek, and cry aloud for help;
At which self-time the house seem'd all on fire,
With dreadful horror of these damned fiends."

Spenser.

BORN CIR. A. D. 1553.—DIED A. D. 1596.

THE century that immediately followed the death of Chaucer constitutes the most stormy period in the annals of England. The ill-established usurpation of the house of Lancaster, shaken by repeated insurrections, even during the life of its able founder, and illustrated rather than invigorated by the brilliant career of his heroic son, became at last, under the feeble sceptre of the sixth Henry, only a watch-word for awakening the fury of a divided population, and stirring the atrocities of a contest, which, whether we look to its protracted and exhausting fluctuations, or to the savage and unsparing character of its ever reciprocating barbarities, is without a parallel among all the great national tragedies that have at any other time spread bloodshed and desolation over our land. It was not till the tyranny of Richard was overthrown at Bosworth, and Henry VII. had united in his own favour the suffrages of all the parties in the state by his marriage with the only remaining daughter of the house of York, that men could be said to enjoy so much as a breathing time from the work of mutual slaughter, either in the field or on the scaffold. "This," says Hume, speaking of the battle of St Alban's, in 1455, "was the first blood spilt in that fatal quarrel, which was not finished in less than a course of fifty years, which was signalized by twelve pitched battles, which opened a scene of extraordinary fierceness and cruelty, is computed to have lost the lives of eighty princes of the blood, and almost entirely annihilated the ancient nobility of England." It is not to be wondered at that, amid the distraction of a time such as this, the voice of song was silent. The ears of men were too much occupied with other notes to be in tune for listening to those of the poet's lyre. With the exception, accordingly, of the obscure names of Oocleve and Lydgate, and a mob of other mere versifiers still less deserving of attention, the history of English poetry is a blank from the death of Gower, the contemporary and friend of

Chaucer, in the beginning of the 15th century to the appearance of Lord Surrey and Sir Thomas Wyatt, more than a hundred and fifty years after. The publication of the poems of these two brother-bards was followed, after a short interval, by that of the singular work entitled, the 'Mirror of Magistrates,' only memorable, in a literary point of view, on account of two very remarkable poems which it contains, the productions of Thomas Sackville, then a very young man, and probably a student of law, but afterwards ennobled by the titles of Lord Buckhurst and Earl of Dorset.

Edmund Spenser, one of the very greatest of our poets, is supposed to have been born about the year 1553, although even the researches of his latest biographer, Mr Todd, have not succeeded in absolutely determining the date. He was born in East Smithfield, London,—‘merry London,’ as he calls it himself in one of his poems, the *Prothalamion*,

“ My most kindly nurse,
That to me gave this life’s most native source.”

Of his parents not a notice or tradition has come down to us—except that in his collection of sonnets entitled ‘*Amoretti*,’ he speaks of his mother’s name as being Elizabeth. It appears, however, from various passages in his works, that he considered himself to be a connexion of the noble house of Spenser, or Spencer, and that the relationship was recognized by the principal branches of the family. Of his boyhood nothing is known. He appears by the college-records to have entered as a sizer of Pembroke-hall, Cambridge, on the 20th of May, 1569, and here he seems to have remained till he took his degree of A.M. on the 26th of June, 1576. His future productions amply testify how industriously he had employed the period of his academic residence in storing his mind with extensive, varied, and accurate learning. He is supposed to have finally left college in consequence of some disappointment which he met with, or of something which he and his friends construed into an act of injustice on the part of the authorities. Mr Todd is of opinion that he had before this time published some anonymous compositions in verse, and there seems to be no doubt, at any rate, that he had already acquired among his acquaintances a reputation for poetical abilities. One of the most intimate of his college friends was Gabriel Harvey, himself a poet, and also the author of several works in prose. It was Harvey who first drew Spenser to London. On quitting the university, the poet had, in the first instance, gone to reside with some of his relations in the north of England, in the capacity, as is conjectured, of domestic tutor; but, on Harvey’s urgent representations, he was induced, in 1578, to come up to the metropolis, then, as it has ever since been, the grand theatre for the struggles of literary ambition. His time in the country had not been idly spent; and, besides a prose discourse entitled the ‘*English Poet*,’ which was never published, he brought many poetical compositions to town with him. Immediately on his arrival he was introduced by Harvey to Sir Philip Sidney, already one of the most distinguished patrons, as well as most promising ornaments of English literature. Sidney, besides recommending Spenser to the favour of his uncle, the Earl of Leicester, took him with him to his seat at Penshurst, in Kent, and detained him there for some time, availing himself,

it is supposed, of the learning of his new friend in pursuing his own studies.

The fruit of the leisure which Spenser thus enjoyed appeared the following year by the publication of his 'Shepherd's Calendar,' dedicated to Sidney. In this performance the poet records the history of his courtship of his mistress, Rosalind, and his rejection by her; a theme which he is understood to have taken not from fancy but from his actual experience. Some authorities go so far as to tell us that Rosalind is in fact the very name, almost undisguised, which the cruel fair one bore. She was, they say, a Miss Rosa Lynde. The Shepherd's Calendar may be said at once to have raised Spenser to the first place among the poets of the age. A proof of its popularity is that five editions of it were finished in the course of the first twenty years after it made its appearance. The author, meanwhile, as appears from his correspondence with Harvey, part of which has been preserved, was now eagerly devoting himself to a new task—the composition, namely, of English verses, after the model and measure of the hexameters, pentameters, and iambics of classic song. Some of his efforts in this species of composition have come down to us, which, highly as they seem to have been admired by those of his friends who were plying their powers along with him in the same unnatural toil, are not very likely to have prepossessed less interested judges in favour either of the writer or of his prosodial system. It is gratifying to know, however, that Spenser was very soon cured of this folly. How lamentable a loss should we have sustained had the author of the Fairy Queen taken it into his head to compose that divine poem in hexameters, and, instead of the brightest fancies modulated into the sweetest verse in the world, had lavished all the wealth of his imagination on a vain attempt to make the English language speak with a Latin accent. It is certain that he had already begun the composition of the great work we have just mentioned, and it is probable that many of his hours were given to it, notwithstanding the dissuasions of his friend Harvey, who seems to have considered the time bestowed upon it as a very unprofitable subtraction from his other labours, the hexameters, and nine comedies, to which, it would appear, he intended, in imitation of Herodotus, to give the names of the nine muses. Our poet was crelong, however, destined to enter upon a new career. In 1580, Lord Grey of Wilton having been appointed lord-deputy of Ireland, Spenser was selected to accompany him to that country in the capacity of his secretary. For this honourable appointment he was probably indebted to the recommendation of the earl of Leicester. Lord Grey, however, was recalled in 1582, and Spenser, it is understood, returned with him to England. From this period we lose sight of him till, in 1586, we find him put in possession of 3028 acres of land in the county of Cork, being part of the forfeited estate of the earl of Desmond, by a grant dated the 27th of June that year, in which it is stated that the gift was bestowed upon him for his services to her majesty in Ireland. In the following October he lost his attached and powerful friend, Sidney, who was mortally wounded at the battle of Zutphen, in the thirty-second year of his age, having already acquired a more brilliant reputation than any other individual of his time, both in letters and in arms. Spenser is supposed to have, immediately after this event,

returned to Ireland, to reside upon his estate, as he was bound to do by the terms of the grant. It was a beautiful sylvan domain, in every way fit for the retreat of a poet. The dwelling-house, which was named Kilcolman castle, had been an old seat of the earls of Desmond, and was sheltered within an amphitheatre of woody hills, while the beautiful stream of the Mulla meandered through the pastoral fields on which it looked down in front. Here he was visited, probably in the summer of 1589, by the afterwards celebrated Sir Walter Raleigh then newly returned from his expedition to Portugal. Raleigh, himself a poet, was charmed with the society of a kindred spirit like Spenser, and the two spent some happy days together, which Spenser has not forgotten to celebrate. To Raleigh, Spenser read his manuscript poem of the Fairy Queen, so far as it was finished, and his guest was so much delighted, that he earnestly entreated his new friend no longer to delay giving the work, even incomplete as it was, to the world. The consequence was that Spenser accompanied Raleigh to England, and the first three books of the Fairy Queen were published at London, in a quarto volume, in the year 1590. On his arrival in the English metropolis also, Spenser had immediately been introduced by Raleigh to the queen, who, in February, 1590-1, bestowed upon him a pension of fifty pounds. A tradition is mentioned by Fuller in his *English Worthies* respecting Spenser's treatment at court, which hardly accords with these ascertained facts. Spenser's merits, we are told, remained unrewarded by her majesty till she had read or heard a portion of the Fairy Queen, when she was so highly pleased that she ordered the poet to be presented with a hundred pounds. This largess, however, was considered too munificent for the occasion by her minister, Burleigh; and, on his objecting, she desired him to give whatever was reasonable. Burleigh took a very easy way of obeying this command of his royal mistress, and declined giving the poet any thing. Spenser long endeavoured to move the obdurate minister, but without success; and Fuller gives us the following doggrel as the effusion in which he finally expressed his sense of the usage he had met with:—

“I was promised, on a time,
To have reason for my rhyme:
From that time unto this season,
I received not rhyme nor reason.”

The patent for the pension of fifty pounds, which we have mentioned, seems to refute this story, at least in the shape which it has assumed in the popular tradition. At the same time, like other such fictions, it probably had some foundation in truth; and indeed there are various passages in the writings of Spenser himself which seem to refer distinctly enough as to his own experience as an unsuccessful, or, at least, long disappointed suitor for court favour. One remarkable passage of this description is in his ‘*Mother Hubbard's Tale*’:—

Full little knowest thou that hast not tried,
What hell it is in suing long to bide;
To lose good days that might be better spent;
To waste long nights in pensive discontent;
To speed to-day—to be put back to-morrow;
To feed on hope—to pine with fear and sorrow;
To have thy Prince's grace, yet want her Peir's;

*To have thy asking, yet wait many years ;
 To fret thy soul with crosses and with cares ;
 To eat thy heart with comfortless despairs ;
 To fawn, to crouch, to wait, to ride, to run,
 To spend, to give, to want, to be undone.
 Unhappy wight ! born to disastrous end,
 That doth his life in so long tendance spend."*

In other places the allusion to the circumstance of the royal bounty being intercepted on its way to him by the opposition of some individual minister, is even more direct than it is in the couplet which we have printed in Italics.

Soon after the publication of his poem, if not before it had actually issued from the press, Spenser appears to have returned to Ireland. The Fairy Queen was admirably suited to the taste of that splendid and romantic age, and, as soon as it appeared, was everywhere read with enthusiasm. Such was the popularity of the author, that Ponsonby, his publisher, immediately exerted himself to collect all the other poetical pieces he could any where find written by the same pen, and, in 1591, published the 'Ruins of Time,' 'Mother Hubbard's Tale,' and several other compositions of Spenser's together, in a quarto volume, under the title of 'The Complaints.' It is not ascertained that any of these poems, with the exception of that entitled 'Muispotmos,' had appeared in print before. They rather seem, indeed, to have been collected by Ponsonby from various individuals in whose hands they remained in manuscript. He regrets that he had not been able to recover a considerable number more of the author's productions, which he was desirous of adding to his collection. Spenser seems to have paid another visit to London about the close of this year or the commencement of the following. The dedication prefixed to his 'Daphnida' is dated London, January, 1591-2. That of his 'Colin Clout's come Home Again,' addressed to Raleigh, is also dated the 27th of December, 1591; but this is acknowledged on all hands to be an error of the press. The poem in question, which was accompanied by an elegy on Sidney, under the name of Astrophel, certainly did not appear till 1595, and the dedication should no doubt be dated either in that year or in 1594. In 1595, also, appeared a collection of sonnets, entitled 'Amoretti,' by our author, which he had sent over for publication from Ireland. They are eighty-eight in number, and contain the history of his courtship of his wife, an Irish girl of great beauty, but humble birth, whom he had just married. There is great uncertainty as to the date of Spenser's marriage; and some of the writers of his life indeed tell us that he had been married for the first time long before this, and that the person celebrated in the sonnets—of whom little more is known, except that her christian name, like that of his mother, was Elizabeth—was, in fact, his second wife. This statement, however, rests upon very insufficient evidence, and has been generally rejected as incorrect. Mr Todd's conclusion is, that the sonnets were written during the years 1592 and 1593; and that the nuptials of the poet and his bride were probably celebrated at Cork on St Barnabas' day, 1594, as seems to be intimated in the poem entitled 'The Epithalamion,' which appeared along with the 'Amoretti.' Be this as it may, we find Spenser again in England in the latter part of the year 1596; the dedication to the queen of his four hymns on Love and Beauty,

being dated at Greenwich in September of that year. Soon after appeared his 'Prothalamion,' a poem on the marriage of the ladies Elizabeth and Catherine Somerset; and, in the same year, the second part, consisting of three more books of his *Fairy Queen*, together with a new edition of the first. It was during this visit also that he presented to the Queen his prose dialogue, entitled, 'A View of the State of Ireland;' and the work seems to have been written while he was in England. The 'View of Ireland' remained in manuscript till it was printed in Dublin in 1633, under the superintendence of Sir James Ware. It is in the preface of this work, by the editor, that the story was first given to the world of the loss of the concluding six books of the *Fairy Queen*, by the carelessness of a servant to whom the author had committed them to be conveyed to England for publication. The truth of this anecdote has been much doubted. The only fragments of the remainder of the *Fairy Queen* that ever appeared are the two unfinished cantos on Mutability, being a part of the *Legend of Constancy*, which was first published in the folio edition of 1609.

Spenser returned to Ireland in 1597, and such was the political credit which he had now attained, that it appears he was in 1598 recommended by the crown to be sheriff of Cork for the following year. But before this dignity had been conferred upon him a convulsion occurred in his adopted country, which suddenly laid all his prosperity in the dust. In October 1598, the famous insurrection against the English authorities, known by the name of Tyrone's rebellion, broke out, and instantly covered a great part of the land with confusion and desolation. Spenser was one of the chief sufferers. Drummond of Hawthornden, in his notes of his conversation with Ben Jonson, has preserved the account which the latter gave him of the great poet's misfortunes. According to Jonson, all his property being plundered or destroyed, and his house set on fire, he narrowly escaped with his wife and his two eldest sons from the flames. An infant was left behind and burned to death among the ruins. The homeless fugitives contrived to make their way to England, and arriving in London took up their lodgings at an inn in King-street, Westminster. But the unhappy poet's heart was broken by the terrible blow he had received. It can hardly be supposed that in this emergency, he was altogether deserted either by his numerous and powerful friends, or by the government by which his political importance had been lately so distinctly acknowledged. We cannot therefore give credit to the story which has been told, that he was actually allowed to perish of want, and that when at last the earl of Essex sent him a sum of money, he declined accepting it on the ground that he could not now live to spend it—as if, had he and his family been in this necessity, it would not have been of use to his wife and his children whom he was to leave behind him. He died however at the inn above-mentioned, in January 1598. However much he may have been neglected during the last days of his life, no sooner had his breath departed than rank and genius pressed forward together to honour his memory. The earl of Essex charged himself with the expenses of his funeral; and he was interred in Westminster Abbey, in a grave excavated close to that of Chaucer, the principal poetical writers of the day attended the solemn ceremony, and threw upon the coffin copies of elegies which they had composed upon the

death of their great departed chief. Spenser was thus only about forty-five years of age when he died—although the epitaph on his monument, which says that he was born in 1510, and died in 1596, would give him a life of not much less than twice that extent. This monument, however, was not erected till more than thirty years after the death of the poet, at the expense of the countess of Dorset, who, as well in this case as in that of her other monument which she caused to be placed over the remains of the poet Daniel, at Beckington in Somersetshire, seems to have left both the composition and the cutting of the inscription to the stone mason she employed, who, although possessed of great skill in the latter art, was but an indifferent hand at the former. This blunder, we believe, was first noticed and corrected by Fenton in his notes to Waller's poems.¹ Spenser's wife is understood to have survived him for some time: and both his sons, Sylvanus and Peregrine had descendants. Mr Todd, writing in 1805, states that a lady lineally descended from the poet was understood to be then alive, and to be married to a gentleman named Bunne, who held or had recently held some situation in the custom-house at London. Some years before this, others of his descendants are ascertained to have been living in Ireland.

The *Fairy Queen*, unfinished as it is, will ever be regarded as one of the noblest productions of the English muse. You cannot peruse a page of it without perceiving by the hues of gold and forms of loveliness that are around you, that you have left far behind this prosaic earth, and are wandering in an elysium beautified with the glow and perfumed with the fragrance of brighter flowers than those of this world. The creations of Spenser have all of them a sunshine of their own, whose flush could have been born only of a soul that was all poesy. The reader of Spenser always feels that it is a poet who speaks to him, and that it is the muse's purest inspiration wherewith his soul is holding her high companionship. But he only who has perused the whole of the *Fairy Queen*, can apprehend the full dimensions of that gigantic genius which has lavished upon it so unsparingly the strength of all its attributes, and overloaded it, not in a few painfully elaborate passages, but throughout almost the whole of its dazzling extent, with such insuperable magnificence and beauty. It is thus only that we can appreciate the boundless fertility of that invention which almost seems to us scarcely to have left a single phantom in the whole universe of allegory unsketched, and which not merely in those delineations, but in all its other achievements, piles up its circumstances of novelty and variety with a liberality which it were injustice to call any thing else than altogether inexhaustible, and a grandeur of design and gorgeousness of colouring which it almost tires the eye and fatigues the imagination to contemplate. It is this creative sorcery, we repeat, which constitutes Spenser's loftiest endowment.

¹ See p. 51, edit. of 1750.

Reginald Scott.

DIED A. D. 1599.

REGINALD or REYNOLD SCOTT, was the son of John Scott, Esq. of Scott's hall near Smeeth in the county of Kent, where it is probable he was born about the middle of the sixteenth century, but the precise date of his birth does not appear. He is chiefly remarkable in the history of his country for having effectually counteracted the popular notions which prevailed till his time concerning witchcraft,—a service which justly entitles him to the respect and gratitude of all who feel interested in the civilization and improvement of human society. At the age of seventeen he was sent to Hart hall, Oxford, where he continued to pursue his studies for some time, but without taking any degree. Upon leaving the university, he returned to his native place and continued to devote himself to the pursuits of science and literature. After his marriage, which took place early, he turned his attention to agriculture and gardening. The growth of the hop had about that time excited much attention, and had been successfully introduced into the county of Kent. The first work which Mr Scott published was upon its culture, and was entitled, 'A perfect Platform of a Hop-garden.' But his thoughts were soon after directed to a widely different and more important subject. The frequent charges brought against unhappy and misguided persons for witchcraft,—the prevalence of most pernicious errors, not only among the vulgar, but some of the learned,—and the absurdity and cruelty of the laws upon this subject, powerfully drew his mind to an examination of the origin and history of the prevalent opinions. His great and useful work, entitled 'Discoveries of Witchcraft,' first appeared in 1584, and had a few years after the rare honour of calling forth, as its opponent and refuter, the high and mighty Prince James I. whose 'Demonologie' was printed at Edinburgh, in 1597, and directed, as the preface states, against the damnable opinions of Wierus and Scott. The 'Discoveries of Witchcraft' produced a deep and powerful impression. The author appealed both to the reason and benevolence of the Christian world, and alleged that his object was by his work to prevent the abasement of God's glory, the rescue of the gospel from an alliance with such peevish trumpery, and to advocate favour and Christian compassion towards the poor souls accused of witchcraft, rather than rigour and extremity. But the popularity of the doctrine assailed, continued for a time to bid defiance to the attack. The author drew upon himself universal scorn and odium. Several learned and skilful champions stepped forth to rescue the popular notions from the destruction to which they were doomed. Meric Casaubon, Joseph Glanvil, and Dr John Raynolds, became strenuous defenders of the prevalent opinions, and revivers of them from time to time as they appeared to be gradually decaying. But all in vain. Even the charge of being Sadducees soon wore itself out. The motives and the fears of such writers as Glanvil are to be respected. He saw, or thought he saw in the doctrine of Scott, covert atheism, and therefore fought in this controversy less against the scepticism which denied witchcraft, than against that disbelief in spiritual agency which he thought implicated the im-

mortality of the soul, and the being of a God. "We live in an age," says Glanvil, "wherein atheism is begun in Sadducism, and those that dare not bluntly say there is no God, content themselves, for a fair step and introduction, to deny there are spirits or witches. Which sort of infidels, though they are not so ordinary among the mere vulgar, yet are they numerous in a little higher rank of understandings." Glanvil's essay entitled 'Philosophical considerations against modern Sadducism,' is a very curious and ingenious piece of sophistry, written under the impulse of commendable motives, but at the same time evincing little of the enlargement of mind and freedom from vulgar prejudice which should characterize a sound philosophy. Yet the amiable author flatters himself continually with the persuasion, that his opponents were the only parties that had forfeited the character of true philosophers. He says, "I profess, for mine own part, I never yet heard any of the confident declaimers against witchcraft and apparitions, speak any thing that might move a mind in any degree instructed in the generous kinds of philosophy and nature of things. And for the objections I have recited, they are most of them such as rose out of mine own thoughts, which I obliged to consider what might be to be said upon this occasion. For though I have examined Scott's discovery, fancying that there I should find the strong reasons of men's disbelief in this matter; yet I met not with any thing in this *farrago* that was considerable. For the author doth little but tell odd tales and silly legends, which he confutes and laughs at, and pretends this to be a confutation of the being of witches and apparitions. In all which his reasonings are trifling and childish; and when he ventures at philosophy, he is little better than absurd: so that I should wonder much if any but boys and buffoons should imbibe prejudices against a belief so infinitely confirmed, from the loose and impotent suggestions of so weak a discourse."

It is probable, however, that this attempt to prop up the failing prejudices of the common people and the fond fancies of the learned, only contributed to root up more thoroughly all belief in the doctrine, at least in the minds of educated and benevolent Christians. Glanvil wrote long after Scott's death, but the seventeenth century saw Scott's work revived in two editions. The author lived to read the Royal controvertist's refutation, but died in 1599, two years after its appearance. He is represented as an amiable benevolent man, living much in retirement and conversing chiefly with his books.

Thomas, Lord Sackville.

BORN A. D. 1536.—DIED A. D. 1608.

THIS nobleman, the son of Sir Richard Sackville of Buckhurst, in the parish of Withiam, Sussex, was born in the year 1536. Mr Warton, however, affirms, that his birth should be placed at least six years earlier. It appears that the ancestors of the family came into England with William the Conqueror, and that their descendants have been of great note here ever since. Thomas Sackville first received a private education, and was then entered, it is conjectured, at Hart hall, now Magdalen college, Oxford, whence he removed to Cambridge,

and at a suitable time took the degree of M. A. He was early distinguished by his talent both for Latin and English poetry. After quitting the university, he removed to the Inner temple, where he continued to cultivate his poetic genius. He prosecuted the law so far as to be called to the bar, but without any intention of practising it, having expectations of an ample patrimony. He became a representative in parliament for Westmoreland, in the 4th and 5th years of Queen Mary. About the year 1557, he sketched the plan of a poem, and wrote the introduction to it, under the title of 'The Mirrour of Magistrates'. It was intended to comprehend a view of all the illustrious but unfortunate characters of English history, from the Conquest downward. He found leisure to complete only what he called the Induction and one legend, or the Life of Henry Stafford, duke of Buckingham. The design was committed in its completion to other hands. Some years after, he produced a tragedy, entitled 'Gorboduc,' which was performed in the Inner temple, and afterwards before Queen Elizabeth with great applause. Its popularity was probably increased by the courtly politics which it taught. About the year 1557, he married a lady, his own kinswoman, with whom he passed the whole of his subsequent life. During the first years of Queen Elizabeth's reigns, he became member of parliament for Sussex, and afterwards for Buckinghamshire. After this he went abroad, owing, it is believed, to his extravagant mode of living in his youth, by which his affairs had become embarrassed. His father died in 1566, while he was at Rome, and confined to a prison, but for what cause is not known. His liberation was, however, soon after obtained, and he returned to England to take possession of his large inheritance. In the following year, he received the honour of knighthood, and was raised to the peerage by the title of baron of Buckhurst. He was selected in 1570, on account of his character and accomplishments, by Queen Elizabeth, to head an embassy to the court of Charles IX. of France, to compliment that monarch on his marriage with the daughter of the Emperor Maximilian. His taste for magnificent display on this occasion again embarrassed him with heavy debts. He was afterwards employed on several important missions to foreign courts. One of these, which was designed to inquire into the complaints of the Low Countries against the earl of Leicester, was the occasion of his being confined to his own house. The reports which he brought home were so displeasing to the royal favourite, that the queen forbade him the enjoyment of his liberty for nine months. On the death of Leicester, he was, however, immediately released. Such was the spirit of submission to royalty in this chivalrous age, that Lord Buckhurst, upon the testimony of his chaplain, Abbot, during all this period, refused to see either wife or child. But the removal of Leicester made way for the promotion of Buckhurst. In 1589, the queen conferred upon him the order of the garter, and employed her royal will to procure for him the chancellorship of Oxford, in opposition to the earl of Essex, whom, though another new favourite, she occasionally took a delight in humiliating. While residing at Oxford as chancellor, the queen honoured him with a visit of several days. In 1598, Lord Buckhurst was united with the treasurer Burleigh in negotiations for a peace with Spain, and subsequently signed a new treaty with the States-general, very advantageous to Eng-

land. Upon the death of Burleigh, the queen nominated him to the office of treasurer. In this situation, he is said to have been eminently serviceable to her majesty in detecting and defeating the ambitious projects of the earl of Essex. He also sat as high steward, and conducted himself with great propriety and humanity at the trial of that unfortunate nobleman. He was distinguished by political independence, though he appears to have been entirely devoted to the service of his queen, and to have stood entirely in her good graces. On this account she continued to place her confidence in him, and to employ him in the most important affairs as long as she lived. After the queen's death and the accession of James I., his office of treasurer was confirmed to him for life. In 1604, he was created earl of Dorset, but did not long survive to enjoy his new honours. He continued his attention to affairs of state to the last hour of his life, dying at the council-table in April, 1608, at the age of eighty, or nearly so. Although the earl of Dorset is not to be placed in the foremost rank of statesmen, yet, as a speaker and writer, he is entitled to the highest respect of posterity. He composed nearly all his state-papers himself, and made valuable improvements in the style and taste of English poetry. It is no light praise that he perceived the absurdity and impiety of scriptural dramas, and struck out a less questionable amusement for mankind in the incidents of common history. He brought the English heroic verse nearly to perfection, and gave the first specimen of tragedy in blank verse. His 'Gorboduc' was the first dramatic piece of any note in the language, and was written many years before Shakspeare composed his plays. Its first title was 'The Tragedie of Ferrex and Porrex.' He was assisted in it by Norton, a fellow-labourer of Sternhold and Hopkins. It was surreptitiously and incorrectly printed in 1565; but more completely in 1570; and in 1590, took the title of 'Gorboduc.' It was republished in 1736 by Dodsley, with a preface by Mr Spence, at the suggestion of Pope, who "wondered that the propriety and natural ease of it had not been better imitated by the dramatic authors of the succeeding age." Sir Philip Sydney, in his 'Apology for Poetry,' gives this lofty character of it:—"It is full of high sounding phrases, climbing to the heights of Seneca's style, and as full of notable morality, which it doth most delightfully teach, and so obtain the very end of poesy."

The 'Mirrour of Magistrates' which he commenced and sketched, was completed by Mr Baldwine, Mr Higgons, Mr Ferrers and Mr Churchyard, men highly esteemed for their genius and accomplishments.

The earl also wrote a Latin letter prefixed to Clarke's translation into Latin of Castiglione's 'Courtier,' printed 1571. There are also several letters of the earl's preserved in the *Cabala*, and one to the earl of Sussex, printed in the Howard Collection, p. 297.¹

The following epigram on his death is preserved by Aubery, in his 'Letters of Eminent Persons,' vol. ii. p. 331:—

Uncivill Death, that wouldst not once conferre,
Dispute or parle with our treasurer!
Had he been thee, or of thy fatal tribe,
He would have spared thy life, and ta'ne a bribe.

¹ Collin's Dict.—Aiken's Biog.—Walpole's Royal and Noble Authors.

He that so often had, with gold and witt,
Injured strong law, and almost conquered it,
At length for want of evidence to shewe,
Was forced himself to take a deadly blowe.

The allusion in the two last lines is to the statement, that a trial was proceeding before the council, when the lord-treasurer, Dorset, took from his bosom some writings to give as evidence, saying, "There is that will strike you dead; and as soon as he had spoken these words, fell downe stark dead in the place."

John Dee.

BORN A. D. 1527.—DIED A. D. 1608.

FEW names occur in the early history of English science more deserving of notice than that of John Dee. Living in an age when philosophy was encumbered with a load of scholastic subtleties, and perverted in its very spirit by superstition and credulity, he evinced a strength and vigour of intellect, which were sufficient for every thing, but to overcome the temptations peculiar to the period in which he laboured. Had he lived posterior to Bacon, and possessed the light which the inductive system would have afforded him, the happiest results might, in all probability, have crowned the almost gigantic energy with which he pursued the sciences. But an ardent temperament led him to espouse the wildest theories that were afloat in his age, and the little solid reputation he has enjoyed with posterity, is owing not to the value of his works, but to the records which remain of his wonderful assiduity and acquirements.

This remarkable man was born in London, July 13, 1527, and could boast of being descended from one of the most ancient families in Wales. His father, who is generally stated to have been a vintner, was a man of property, and sent his son, at the age of fifteen, to Cambridge, where he was entered at Saint John's college. The devotion to study which distinguished him through life, characterised the very commencement of his career. "I was sent by my father"—says he in an account he gives of himself at this period—"to the university of Cambridge, there to begin with logic, and so to proceed in the learning of arts and sciences, for I had before been meetly well furnished with understanding of the Latin tongue, I being then somewhat above fifteen years old. In the years 1543, 1544, 1545, I was so vehemently bent to study, that for those years I did inviolably keep this order; only to sleep four hours every night; to allow to meat and drink, and some refreshing after, two hours every day; and of the other eighteen hours, all, except the time of going to, and being at, the divine service, was spent in my studies and learning."

The same enthusiastic love of learning which had kept him to this laborious course of probationary application at the university, induced him, in the year 1547, to visit the Netherlands, then the residence of many of the most erudite scholars in Europe. He continued there several months, and on his return to Cambridge was elected to a fellowship in the newly erected college of Trinity. The following year he made a journey to the university of Louvain, and such was the reputation he had already acquired, that he was visited during his residence

there, by the duke of Mantua, and other persons of similar rank. His next journey was to Paris, in the university of which city he delivered lectures on the Elements of Euclid, and obtained by the learning he displayed on that occasion, so much applause, that the heads of the establishment strongly urged him to accept the honourable office of mathematical professor to the institution. This, however, he declined, and returning to his own country, was introduced to King Edward VI. and received the grant of an hundred crowns per annum, which he soon after exchanged for the rectory of Upton-upon-Severn.

The reign of Mary proved a time of severe trial to Dee, as well as to many other men of free and enlightened minds. Notwithstanding his studious habits, he appears to have been deeply interested in the politics of the day, and his too familiar intercourse with the partizans of the Princess Elizabeth, at length led to his apprehension and close confinement. To what subsequent punishment the ill will he had incurred might have led, had his reputation not saved him, it is impossible to say, but the queen, on the representation of some of his friends, was induced to liberate him, and we find him soon after, courting her royal attention to a project for preserving certain ancient monuments which were falling into decay.

On the accession of Elizabeth, he became still more conspicuous among the distinguished personages of the court. Lord Robert Dudley consulted him respecting the fittest season for the coronation of her majesty, and directed him to employ all his astrological skill to that end. Elizabeth, herself, professed a desire to become acquainted with his works; and discovering that it would be hopeless to attempt the unriddling of their mystical meaning without the aid of the author himself, invited him to her residence, and devoted three days to conversing with him on the subject of his treatises. Her majesty, it appears, did not respect him the less for the difficulties which attended these disquisitions, but promised him the deanery of Gloucester, which, however, was in the end given to another candidate for royal favour, who possessed superior interest, and perhaps more theological accomplishments.

About the year 1570, he again appeared before the public as an author, having written a preface and copious notes to Sir Henry Bilingsley's translation of Euclid, published at this time. We soon after find him quietly settled at Mortlake, pursuing with undiminished ardour, his favourite studies, and possessed of a library which surpassed most of the private collections then existing in England. The splendour of this assortment of rare and valuable works was sufficiently great to induce Queen Elizabeth to pay our author a visit; but the burial of his wife had taken place only a few hours before her majesty's arrival, and she remained contented with examining some of the philosophical instruments which he brought out of the house for her inspection. Other instances of her respect for him are on record; especially that of her sending him to Germany to consult with the physicians of that country respecting her health, and her entrusting him with the duty of examining her claim to newly discovered countries.

Allusion has already been made to the credulity and enthusiasm which characterised this remarkable man. He had already given some instances of this weakness in his mode of speculating on the comets which appeared about this time; but it was not till the year 1581, that his mind seems to have yielded entirely to the deluding fascinations of the

occult science. In that year he united himself in strict intimacy with one Edward Kelley, a young man who professed extraordinary skill in magic, and whom, on that plea, our author was glad to engage as his assistant at the yearly salary of fifty pounds. While pursuing their operations with all the zeal which usually distinguishes the votaries or such arts, a Polish nobleman, named Albert Laski, and palatine of Siradia, arrived in England, and being strongly imbued with the love of magic, Dee and his friend Kelley found in him a new and powerful patron. Their intimacy increasing, and the ability to call up spirits from the abyss not proving a charm against poverty, the palatine persuaded the magicians to attend him to Poland, whither they accordingly accompanied him in 1584. There, however, after a brief season of delusion, Count Laski recovered the use of his reason, and Mr Dee with his associate was advised to seek the patronage of the emperor Rodolph. This advice was taken, and the emperor received the philosophers with flattering attention, but the latter is said to have so disgusted him by the absurd extravagance and vanity of his pretensions, that he refused to see him after the first interview. A similar result followed the visit which Mr Dee was then induced to pay the king of Poland, and on his return to the imperial court, he had the mortification to find himself banished, at the instance of the pope's nuncio, from the emperor's dominions. In this predicament, he gladly availed himself of the protection offered him by the young count of Rosenberg, in whose castle of Trebona, both he and his family, together with Kelley, resided for some time. During this period, their incantations were carried on with persevering labour, and the most marvellous tales are recorded of their discoveries, and communications with the spiritual world,—Dee declaring that he saw angels, and Kelley, who now began to discover the errors into which they had fallen, assuring his master that they were but devils. At length, the queen of England, from some motive the nature of which it would be difficult to determine, invited the deluded philosopher to return, and provided him, it appears, with the means of doing so in a manner more becoming an ambassador than an impoverished scholar.

It was with great difficulty that he contrived to recover his books and furniture which had been scattered widely about since his departure from Mortlake. His affairs also were in every respect in the utmost disorder. This induced him to memorialize the court, and he was at last appointed to the wardenship of Manchester college. His residence, however, in that establishment was far from felicitous, and he returned in about eight years, weary and discontented, to Mortlake. There he was again seized with a violent fit of enthusiasm for incantations, which, it appears, he pursued with ruinous activity to the end of his days. Poverty, disappointment, and neglect, thus became his attendants to the grave, and his death, which occurred in 1608, deprived the learned world of one of its brightest but most useless ornaments.

Attempts have been made to show that the papers and journals which were found after his decease, ought not to be regarded as relating to his astrological or magical pursuits, but as political memoranda on subjects of high importance. There is, however, no sufficient evidence for this supposition, and the whole course of the author's life leads to the opposite conclusion.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

TO FIFTH PERIOD,

EXTENDING

FROM THE ACCESSION OF JAMES I. TO THE REVOLUTION.

WITH

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES

OF

Eminent Englishmen

WHO FLOURISHED DURING THAT PERIOD.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

TO

FIFTH PERIOD.

Adequate causes to be sought for all great national revolutions—Progress of the public mind since the Reformation—Infatuation of Charles I.—State of public feeling previous to the breaking out of the Civil war—Character of the opposed parties—Milton's sketch of the appearances presented by the nation at this juncture—First measures of Charles's government—The Star-chamber and High-commission courts—Hampden and Cromwell forbidden to leave the country—Remarks by Lord Nugent on Charles's prohibition of emigration—Influence of the press on the events of the day—The censorship—Conduct of Charles with regard to the Hugunots—Buckingham obnoxious to the popular party—Charles's third parliament—The petition of right—Charles resolves to rule without parliaments—Laud's violent measures—Re-assembling of parliament—Grimstone and Pym—The Long parliament—Strafford's impeachment—Execution of the king—Cromwell—Violent measures resorted to by the protector—Contentions of the commons—Cromwell's death—Monk—Review of this era—Character of Cromwell—Caution requisite with regard to the statements of popular writers after the restoration—Intellectual character of the age—Distinguished Oxonians—Poets—Ornaments of the English church.

GREAT and sudden revolutions in public opinion, and in national institutions, rarely take place without adequate and justifiable causes. Although such changes are liable to excess in many directions, as they call forth the most vigorous and fertile minds more prone to action than to reflection, yet the presumption is always strong, that the previous state of things had grown intolerable by its abuses and corruptions, or that it had become unsuitable to the altered circumstances and advancing improvement of the great body of the people. Partisans will endeavour on the one side to extenuate and on the other to exaggerate these causes of change. The one will multiply and magnify them beyond due bounds; the other will deny that they had any existence, or at least any just and reasonable foundation. Such is pre-eminently the case with nearly all the distinguished annalists, historians, and biographers, who have undertaken to give us a full and true representation of the men and measures of the era now under review. This is the more to be regretted, because there is no period of British

history so pregnant with instruction, so rich in national glory, so fertile in examples of personal eminence and excellence. It should be the ambition of an exact historian to lay aside all peculiarities of creed and party, and regulate every judgment by the rules of a calm and severe philosophy. Unless his representations be impartial and complete, they commit an act of injustice upon the dead and of fraud upon the living. He becomes a false or an incompetent witness. Perhaps it is an essential ingredient in that human infirmity from which even philosophic historians are not exempt, to take part with those heroes of their story in whose feelings and sentiments they most nearly sympathize.

Such at least is the most charitable excuse we can frame for the defect we have pointed out; and such, we trust, will be the charitable extenuation the reader will apply to ourselves, should he in the following pages light upon any statement which may seem to merit the censure we have passed upon others. At the same time we forewarn him that we are not ambitious of the honour—if honour it may be deemed—of entertaining a cold and stoical indifference, or of affecting a philosophic superiority towards the great national events, the national lights and shadows of the Commonwealth-era. It would be traitorous to the interests of humanity to contemplate those struggles without emotion, and to record the lives of those patriots without eulogy. We shall, however, endeavour to steer a middle course between indiscriminate admiration on the one hand, and blind censure on the other. It is not our business in these introductory notices to our Biography, to enter at length into political matters; and it is our intention no further to touch upon them, than as they explain and elucidate the mental and personal history which is our ultimate object. It will however be gratifying to the reader to know, if it can be explained within a moderate space, what were the causes which made the period under review so prolific of great men, great works, and great events. That such were the features of this time none can deny, whatever party they follow and whatever principles they adopt. The episcopalian and the puritan, the republican and the monarchist, will alike glory in the advocates of his opinions which this age supplies, and will at once refer to their names as the most honoured and the most illustrious.

There must have existed some singular causes or combination of causes, to have made this stormy and convulsive period stand out before all others of British history pre-eminent for genius, learning, patriotism, wisdom, and piety. The names of Milton and Taylor, Usher and Pocock, Pym and Hampden, Baxter and Leighton, with a host of others unrivalled in every department of human attainment and excellence, will at once justify the eulogy we have passed. We shall not at present farther delay or annoy the reader by citing proofs of our assertion, but refer doubters to the specific biographies which follow, and proceed to our design of explaining some of the causes,—so far as human sagacity may detect them,—which gave birth to all that greatness and excellence with which this period is ennobled.

It must be obvious to every attentive reader of history, that, from the early dawn of the Reformation, important and progressive changes had been going on in the popular views of government and religion. Science and literature had advanced by rapid strides, and altogether

the public mind, in the various grades which compose it, had made an onward and upward movement. The exorbitant notions of kingly authority which pervaded all classes during the reigns of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, began evidently to decline during the dynasty of the first of the Stuarts. The extravagancies of his predecessors, followed as they were by the pedantry and weakness of James I. succeeded effectually in qualifying the popular admiration of royal wisdom, and in shaking the foundations of that universal obsequiousness to royal authority, which had been inherited from the ages of darkness, superstition, and tyranny. This revolution in the public feelings kept on advancing, silently but surely, through the reign of the first Charles, until it grew into a fixed and rooted conviction that governments and governors exist for the sake of the governed. This sentiment gave birth to free speculation and enlightened discussion, which broke the trammels imposed upon mind, and gave birth to many new theories and principles which blazed forth into hostility against existing institutions and established principles of legislation and government. Monarchy by its abuses had provoked this hostility; and episcopacy by its sycophancy to power and to wealth had embittered and tempted it. The causes which had long been exacerbating the public sense of wrong had undergone no melioration; while an immense reinforcement of the public power of resistance had been supplied by the cultivation of the mind, the advancement of knowledge, and the accumulations of genius. The dramatists and poets of the age of Elizabeth, surpassed by many degrees their contemporaries in every other department of literature, and supplied a powerful stimulus to the genius of the succeeding age. While this splendid superiority scarcely left them a hope of rivalry in that department, it still afforded a wide and untrodden field in legislation, learning, and theology, where fresh laurels might be won and an unequalled glory might be obtained. Bacon had supplied new instruments for science; the reformers had loosened the shackles of ecclesiastical authority, had ploughed up the beaten track of opinion, and cast in the vital seed of divine truth; a fructifying dew had fallen upon the long uncultivated soil, and the rising sun of liberty called forth its powers to a vigorous, and, in some cases, to an exuberant and wild productiveness.

The first displays of national vigour were exhibited in an oppugnancy to new encroachments, or to a repetition of oppression, which, if sanctioned by old principles, were at least new in their form and bearing. The rights of monarchy might not perhaps in many of these cases be stretched beyond former precedent,—the bit might not be drawn more tightly nor held more firmly,—but the mouth to be checked had become more tender, and the beast to be driven had grown in spirit and sagacity. He had become much more conscious of his own strength and of his rider's weakness, and had, somehow, lost that sense of national inferiority which had so long proved the instrument of his subjection and acquiescence. He had been hitherto turned whithersoever the governor listed. But his sides had been galled, and his spirit roused, and thus, by oppression, taught his power and his speed, he became impatient of restraint, indignant at his rider, and proud even of his untractableness. The first symptoms of insubordination which took place under the first Charles instantly inflamed the chafed rider. The will of the sovereign had been the sovereign will, but it was no longer accom-

panied with sovereign power. The enchantment was broken, and the day of freedom was at hand. But the resistance which was manifested, instead of being met on the part of the sovereign by soothing gentleness and wise concession, bred in his lofty nature, fear, jealousy, and resolution. Self-will was his pilot and his pole-star, but it proved in the end the fatal lure that drew him on to his destruction. He forgot that he numbered not in his council a Cecil, a Walsingham, or a Burleigh. When he demanded the committal of five such men as Hazelrig, Nollis, Strode, Hampden and Pym, with Lord Kimbolton from the house of peers, he should have remembered what a many-headed power he was assailing, and what an altered time had befallen him. When he condescended in person to enter the lower house, and there required the surrender of the accused members, the memorable reply of the speaker might have admonished him, that he had advanced incautiously to the brink of a precipice, and bearded a lion in his den. "Sir," said the ready and prudent speaker, "I have neither eyes to see, nor tongue to speak in this place, but as the house is pleased to direct me, whose servant I am. And I humbly ask your pardon that I cannot give any other answer to what your majesty is pleased to demand of me." But Charles was infatuated to his fall. Already his precipitation had hurried him over the brink, and he fell forthwith from depth to depth, with an accelerated momentum. But these occurrences, so fatal to monarchy and episcopacy, were but exciting causes applied to those elements of convulsion, which had long been forming, and which had occasionally rumbled faintly and at a distance. Charles might have been more rash and violent at an earlier period without risk to his throne; and he might have been less imprudent in the present conjuncture without being able long to delay the threatened convulsion. The spark, however, was now struck among the combustibles, which had for some years been but lightly covered, and the flame kindled with amazing rapidity. The very means taken by the ill-starred monarch to quell the spirit of the storm, while they attest the absence of all political sagacity from his councils, show the ripeness of the public mind for important and extensive changes. It cannot be admitted that a whole nation, or even a large part of it, can have any interest in public commotions, or can be extensively influenced by demagogues without reason, or by fanatics destitute both of truth and piety. Amidst a numerous and extensive population, comprising all shades of opinion, all degrees of intelligence, all varieties of talent, rising regularly from the lowest to the highest, and intermingling in daily intercourse, a check and counteraction is constantly supplied to unreasonable pretenders, to the empiricism of political quacks, and the mere fanaticism of religionists; and when any of them gain an undue hold upon the public regard, and thereby threaten or effect great changes, they must have derived their most efficient machinery from the pre-existing state of public feeling towards those institutions which are assailed. The republicans, for instance, of the age under review, would have found no handle by which they could have seized and wielded the public mind, if the abuses and corruptions of monarchy itself had not supplied them. The religious innovators would have found no entrance for their innovations and novelties, if the church itself had not left the public mind unoccupied and unfortified. The

affections of the people would not have been so easily seduced, if they had not been first loosened, nor would they have listened to the proposal of a more excellent way, if they had felt themselves happy and safe in that by which they had hitherto been led. But discontent grew out of oppression, and prepared men for change. Change produced excitement, and gendered a passion for fresh changes, which increased as it was gratified, till the boldest and most extensive innovations were contemplated with hope, even without any very distinct conception of the good to be realized. Such were the evils men suffered from the existing order of things, that they deemed no change could be for worse, and might be greatly for the better. Thus all the elements of society were moved and dissolved; its frame-work began to totter, and its foundations were soon found to be out of course. Every one was for putting himself into an attitude of inquiry and solicitude; and each rose to claim and protect his rights against the common foe. All the emotions of men's hearts at this period were of a grave and serious character. They seemed like a company of mariners who foresaw the impending storm, and who were instinctively preparing to stand every man to his post and employ all the means that energy and foresight could supply to save all that was dear to each.

They were long in preparation for the struggle, and had time for deep deliberation. Hence they were led to first principles. Events as they arose placed the parties, for a considerable time, in the position of intellectual opponents. The war came on by slow degrees. It was not the effort of a sudden glow of resentment against oppression; it was not a conflagration kindled by an accidental spark; but it was the result of long-cherished, deep-rooted, *principled*, resentment at inveterate misrule. Hence a very large number—and those of the most stirring and masculine spirits—were intellectually and morally prepared for the final appeal. They had calculated their chances for the last throw, and were ready to make it. In their studies they had become familiar with danger,—had imagined themselves the avengers of their country's wrongs, the arbiters of a nation's fate,—patriots, heroes, martyrs. Still it may be said there was no concerted scheme of co-operation. There was no systematic opposition to arbitrary measures. The leaders of the popular cause were often brought, suddenly and unexpectedly, and without any design on their part, into situations that called forth all the higher qualities of mind. The displays which were frequently made in the house of commons, especially while yet it was a war of reason, were such as cannot be reviewed by a philanthropic mind, without feeling that our nature, as well as our nation, was ennobled by them. The struggle involved even from the first every thing that men counted most dear to them. No wonder that the convulsion shook the whole body, and was felt in the most distant extremities. Each party contended for what he conceived to be most sacred in religion, and most important in civil government. Hence the contest was of a mixed and double character. The confessor and the patriot were united in the same person. The reformer of the state was the reformer of the church. And, on the other hand, the hierarchy and the throne were banded in a common cause. They had resolved not only to fall rather than suffer encroachments and alterations, but even to recover what had been lost to them by the Reformation, and the

spirit of liberty it had diffused. There was, to a certain extent, a fine and lofty spirit among the cavaliers. Their devotion to the royal cause did honour at least to their fidelity and loyalty. But the depth of principle and feeling, on either side, rendered the hostility irreconcilable, and mutually provoked them to deeds of the greatest daring and self-sacrifice. Had the one party been less resolute in their purposes, the other had appeared less heroic in action; and had not both numbered among their leaders men of valour and renown, the strife had not been so long, nor so prolific of greatness and of glory. There was hence a constant and perpetually increasing excitement going on. The daily, the almost hourly collision of the parties in private and in public, gave this excitement increasing impetus, and contributed to augment its power for fresh strifes. It was not a conflict among the lower members of the State. It was not a servile war, but a war among all that were great, magnanimous, and illustrious. That which began in silent reflection and thought, soon propagated itself into books, moved the whole of society by conversation and by speeches, till at last it ripened into deadly conflict, dividing the men of the same country, often men of the same family, into two hostile armies. At this period England presented the rare example of a nation as active with the pen as with the word. Discussion of principles kept pace with the growth of courage and the march of war. Revolutions are usually produced by sudden impulses, frequently by low-minded demagogues. The agents are generally ambitious, stirring men, more prone to violent passion than to deep reflection and grave argument. The world in which such live is that of matter and circumstance, not that of mind and thought. They gather their impulses from prejudice and accident; their motives are derived from without, not from within. They begin with things as they are, and not with the *beau idéal* of what they ought to be. But England first presented the spectacle of a nation instinct with intellectual life, before she threw down the gauntlet to her own sons, or marshalled her forces for the open field.

“Behold now this vast city,—a city of refuge,—the mansion-house of liberty,—encompassed and surrounded with God’s protection: the shop of war hath not there more hammers and anvils working to fashion out the plates and instruments of armed justice in defence of beleaguered truth, than there be pens and heads there, sitting by their studious lamps musing, searching, revolving new notions and ideas wherewith to present, as with their homage and fealty, the approaching reformation; others as fast reading, trying all things, assenting to the force of reason and conviction. What could a man require more from a nation so pliant and so prone to seek after knowledge? What wants there to such a towardly and pregnant soil, but wise and faithful labourers to make a knowing people, a nation of prophets, of sages, and of worthies? We reckon more than five months yet to harvest; there need not be five weeks; had we but eyes to lift up, the fields are white already. When there is much to learn, then of necessity there will be much arguing, much writing, many opinions; for opinion in good men is but knowledge in the making. Under these fantastic terrors of sect and schism, we wrong the earnest and zealous thirst after knowledge and understanding, which God hath stirred up in this city. What some lament of we rather should rejoice at; should rather praise this pious

forwardness among men, to reassume the ill-deputed cause of their religion into their own hands again. A little generous prudence, a little forbearance of one another, and some grain of clarity, might win all these diligencies to join and unite into one general and brotherly search after truth: could we but forego this prelatical tradition of crowding free consciences and Christian liberties into canons and precepts of men. I doubt not if some great and worthy stranger should come among us, wise to discern the mould and temper of a people, and how to govern it, observing the high hopes and aims, the diligent alacrity of our extended thoughts and reasonings in the pursuance of truth and freedom, but that he would cry out as Pyrrhus did, admiring the Roman docility and courage, 'If such were my Epirots, I would not despair the greatest design that could be attempted to make a church and kingdom happy!' Yet these are the men cried out against for schismatics and sectaries, as if, while the temple of the Lord was building, some cutting, some squaring the marble, others hewing the cedars, there should be a sort of irrational men, who could not consider there must be many schisms and many dissections made in the quarry and in the timber, ere the house of God can be built. And when every stone is laid artfully together, it cannot be united into a continuity, it can but be contiguous in this world; neither can every piece of the building be of one form; nay, rather the perfection consists in this, that out of many moderate varieties and brotherly dissimilarities that are not vastly disproportionate, arises the goodly and the graceful symmetry that commends the whole pile and structure. Let us, therefore, be more considerate builders, more wise in spiritual architecture, when great reformation is expected. For now the time seems come, wherein Moses the great prophet may sit in heaven rejoicing to see that memorable and glorious wish of his fulfilled, when not only our seventy elders, but all the Lord's people, are become prophets. No marvel then though some men, and some good men too perhaps, but young in goodness, as Joshua then was, envy them. They fret, and out of their own weakness are in agony, lest their divisions and subdivisions will undo us. The adversary again applauds, and waits the hour: when they have branched themselves out, saith he, small enough into parties and partitions, then will be our time. Fool! he sees not the firm root out of which we all grow, though into branches; nor will beware until he see our small divided maniples cutting through at every angle of his ill-united and unwieldy brigade."¹ There is, perhaps, no case in which the human heart is roused to greater efforts to sustain itself, to seize its object by violence, or to wreak its vengeance on the agents of its disappointment, than when its fondest hopes are deferred, especially if they have once been near. Our vexation at delay is measured by the ripeness of previous anticipation, and the proximity of possession. To have the cup dashed from our lips just as we are about to taste it, is a thousand-fold more afflicting and exasperating, than simply to have felt the desire of an absent good. Such, manifestly, was the keen disappointment and deferred hope, which stung and roused the nation up to a paroxysm of resolution, mental vigour, and impatience, which at the same moment determined to avenge itself upon the authors of its suf-

¹ Arcopagitica.

ferings, and to effect for itself that consummation it had long and vainly sought from the hands of others, but now saw receding to a greater distance than ever. The Reformation had first gendered these hopes. They had burst suddenly like a delightful vision upon the eyes of men. They had revealed a new world to their senses, and made them feel like beings of another and a higher race. The morning light, mild, but clear and cheerful, had disclosed a beautiful and vast creation, which had been concealed by a long and dreary night of darkness. The novelty of discovery served to sharpen men's senses, and to awaken their faculties to a keener pursuit of long lost, or long hidden truths. Every accession to their knowledge was an accession to their power of knowledge, so that they longed incessantly to encompass the whole field, and to reap from religion and civil government the largest measure of good which they accounted them capable of producing. They counted it by anticipation already their lawful inheritance, and hailed the approaching day when every remaining obstacle to their triumph should be removed,—and thought, and truth, and reason, and books, and discussion, and man, should all be free.

But for some years prior to the breaking out of the civil war, every thing wore an altered aspect. The tide had turned, and was evidently receding. The blossom of their hopes had gone up as dust. Those who had been most patient under delay, and most candid in their interpretation of public measures and of the intentions of public men, began to side with the more jealous and the more impatient. Reformation was not merely at a stand-still; it was retrograding. Principles hostile to public liberty were gaining strength and boldness. Accessions already gained were disputed and reclaimed. At every point the enemy seemed fortifying himself against new advances, and ever prompt for encroachment and aggression. Every measure of the early part of Charles's reign appeared to the people inimical to the consummation of their hopes. They saw the protestant religion corrupted, and fast hastening back again to a system of mummery and imposition. The most anti-protestant doctrines were broached in the highest places. The most esteemed and popular preachers were exposed to annoyance and degradation, while men of popish tendencies were put forward to receive the highest marks of royal favour, and while the court itself openly displayed its bias to popery and arbitrary power. The most unprincipled of all the ministers that ever governed England was allowed to control the king's councils, to settle all foreign relations, and dispose of the resources of the country at his own caprice. Thus, at least, the fears of the people were excited, and such unquestionably were the appearances which public affairs wore. Some have affected to treat those fears with ridicule, and to represent them as unfounded; and Hume has not hesitated to ascribe them to fanaticism. But it is difficult to believe that they were without foundation, or that men of the greatest talents and sagacity,—men of caution and moderation, should have yielded to them, and become the foremost to sound the note of warning and preparation. If the panic began among the fanatics and the sectaries, yet it did not rest with them; and the presumption, therefore, is not that it was groundless, but that it constrained even the most unwilling and unsuspicious, at length to coalesce with the more jealous and impatient. The manner in which those were

treated who pretended boldly to reveal the tendencies of public measures, and the disappointment of public hopes, sufficiently attests the temper and the designs of the court. Had there been no bias towards the restoration of popery, there would have been less uneasiness under the charge, and less severity exercised against the authors of it. But if there had been room for hesitation, and some plausible ground for hope, prior to those severe measures, after their perpetration all became intelligible; concealment could avail no longer; deferred and disappointed hope turned into exasperated despair. It may be said, and not without justice, that, as the great crisis approached, there arose a captious jealousy on the part of the people,—a disposition to construe every act of the sovereign in the worst light possible,—an estrangement of confidence, and an extravagant fear of the apprehended danger. It may even be admitted that the advocates of the popular cause frequently transgressed the bounds of decorum that ought to have been observed when canvassing the measures of their sovereign, and questioning the measures of his government. Yet after all these allowances, it must still be pleaded that such excesses of resentment and fear were perfectly natural, under the impulse of those strong excitements which inflamed the public mind, and of those substantial grounds for apprehending greater evils which the course of past events had supplied. All men are anxious while their possessions or rights are in the power of others. If only their property is a trust, they can scarcely divest themselves of all apprehensions for its security. But as soon as they begin to distrust the honesty, or doubt the solvency of those whom they have trusted, from that moment they become restless and suspicious, and will endeavour to regain their own. The urgency and violence of the measures they adopt for this purpose, will be dictated partly by their love of money, and partly by the imminency of the danger of losing it.

It was perfectly natural at this period that the course of affairs should excite alarm, and that to the highest pitch, for all that was dear to Christians and to Britains. They saw, or thought they saw, the fruits of a whole century of national effort, suffering, and change, on the eve of being snatched from them just when they ought to have tasted it in its maturity. That men of the purest philanthropy and patriotism should feel roused under the influence of such circumstances,—that the master-spirits should kindle into heroism, and put themselves at the head of their species,—that the strife so commenced in the war of opinions should call forth unrivalled energies of thought, and feeling, and expression,—is perfectly accordant with the known laws of our constitution. All the measures taken by the king and his council were an age too late. The spirit of liberty and of free inquiry was not now to be repressed by authority or absolute power. It had risen too high, and had gained too much strength. Opposition did but rouse it further, and call forth bolder and more resolute efforts. The royal will and the mandates of high ecclesiastics were found mere straws thrown against a rapid and swollen tide. Instead of impeding its current, they were themselves swept away by the indignant surge. The star-chamber and high-commission court, though placed by a bold effort of power against the very first risings of the stream, only served like fragments of rock to check its course for a moment, and then to

deepen the waters and ruffle their surface. Bishop Williams had the sagacity to warn the council of these consequences. He clearly saw that severity did but augment the evil, and rouse men's spirits to fiercer opposition and a more indignant and stormy resolution. But his warnings were despised, and his prudence counted as treachery. Though he had been the early friend of Laud, and had procured his first elevation, yet his wisdom and fidelity were first rewarded by exclusion from the council, then by a protracted and ruinous prosecution, lastly by suspension from his office, and an immense fine to the king and the archbishop. Two such courts as those above alluded to were quite sufficient either to crush, in a timid and spiritless people, all resistance to arbitrary power, or, in a nation possessed of courage and genius, to provoke a combination which nothing could withstand. The one court aimed to depress civil liberty, the other, religion. The one claimed more than royal prerogatives over the state, the other exercised a pontifical jurisdiction over the church. The high-commission, whose power bore so severely upon freedom of discussion in religious and intellectual matters, was authorised to take cognizance of seditious books, heretical opinions, false rumours or tales, and slanderers' words, as well as of immoralities. In the execution of this commission they were armed with the fearful power of examining the suspected person upon oath, thereby making him his own accuser, and then in case of any contempt, hesitancy, or otherwise, they could punish by fine, imprisonment, and excommunication. This fearful engine of oppression which was never rivalled, except by the Inquisition, could at any time be brought to act by any three commissioners, one of them only being a prelate. The authority of this court extended to all those matters which, during the times of papal darkness had fallen under the exclusive jurisdiction of the priesthood. Hence there was the substance of papal power exercised by a protestant government; and exercised more efficiently and certainly than had been possible in the later ages of popish dominion, when the civil authority had, in a good measure, checked and limited the power of the church. But now the church and the state were one, so far as power was concerned. Every bishop's court throughout the kingdom became a branch of the high commission court, and all parties slighting or resisting the authority of the inferior tribunal were liable to be impeached, and usually were so before the superior.

The direct effect of both these courts was to repress the outward exercise of liberty, to check the expression of opinion, and to drive back the energy of thought as by a force of compression and restraint, which compelled it to seek a hidden and secret channel where it could flow in defiance of royal and ecclesiastical authority. Its outbreaks in individual cases it was easy to repress; and while the agents of such severities deemed that these would prove effectual restraints to the spirits of daring men, and scare others from the imitation of them, they counted not upon the indirect effects of their measures, and the certainty of creating ten new enemies by crushing one, and of provoking seven fiercer spirits for the one which their incantations might exorcise. But absolute power is indifferent to remote consequences, and impatient of all impediments in the prosecution of its objects. Moreover, the links which connect the fate of nations with the character and the fortunes

of individuals, are usually too minute for detection, too mysterious and subtle for human discovery. Sometimes, like the rills that form and swell the current, they are too numerous to be recounted, or, like the separate drops that form the rill, too inconsiderable to be noticed. Yet occasionally those links are unveiled to our view—those causes seem all concentrated into one, and *that* stands forward with a distinctness and a prominence that cannot be overlooked. Such was the case, particularly by that stretch of arbitrary power which, at the period under consideration, interposed to prevent the removal of Hampden and Cromwell to a distant country, just at the crisis when the absence of these two individuals might have indefinitely delayed, if it had not altogether prevented, the success of the popular cause. This striking fact, by which the unhappy Charles precipitated his own ruin, is a memorable instance of that fatality which attends the reckless and impatient use of power. Lord Nugent, in his recent ‘*Memorials of John Hampden*’ has placed the circumstances which thus hastened the fate of Charles, and the great national revolution, in a clear and instructive light in the following passage :—

“Again the hopes of the country party almost died within them. Had it not been for a fresh act of cruel and unwise compulsion which bereft the persecuted puritans of the power of leaving to Charles, by their flight, an undisputed triumph over law and liberty, the whole struggle would in this country have been abandoned, at least by that generation, in despair. Many eminent persons were induced, by their sufferings, or by their fears, to sell their estates at a great loss, in order to seek a shelter, which, by its distance from home, promised, at least, security from the vindictive spirit of the government, and from the stormy threatenings of the times. The plantations of New England, held under royal patents granted by James, afforded a place of refuge to such as might be driven by hatred of the great tyranny that reigned in their own country, to look for peace and freedom among the wildernesses of another hemisphere. Such a retreat had been prepared there by the foresight of the Lord Say and the Lord Brooke, by whose directions a little town—now the capital of the flourishing province of Connecticut—had been built in 1635, under the name of *Saybrooke*. They had from their boyhood lived together as brothers, and the ties of their affection had been straitened by a close and constant agreement in public life. To this wild and distant settlement they had determined to retreat, in failure of their efforts for justice and peace at home, and there they were jointly to become the founders of a patriarchal community. Of this new settlement, liberty of conscience was to be the first law, and it was afterwards to be governed according to their darling scheme of a free commonwealth. Thither several persons of rank and fortune had already led the way.

“The spirit of emigration spread daily among the puritans; the views of the greater number of that party were entirely directed to that object; thus leaving their leaders without any further hope to cherish, and, indeed, without any further duties to fulfil, in England. But even this refuge from a persecution which appeared irresistible, and from which there remained no other means of escape, was refused them. This project, which would also have relieved the government from the embarrassment of their presence, and of all their further plans, was

defeated by an order of the king in council, dated April 6, 1638, by which all masters and owners of ships were restrained from setting forth any vessel with passengers for America, without special license. The immediate effect of this monstrous edict is rendered remarkable by an event which has thrown over the whole an air of strange fatality. Eight ships, with respectable emigrants on board, were, at this time, lying in the Thames, bound for the new colony. In one of these had actually embarked for their voyage across the Atlantic two no less considerable persons than John Hampden and his kinsman Oliver Cromwell; the latter then little distinguished, except for an opposition which he had conducted with great spirit and ability in his native county of Huntingdon against the project of the Bedford level, a work which, like all the other great schemes of improvement, had been converted into a monopoly, which was to give new means of influence to the crown.

"A special order was issued that these vessels should be detained, and the provisions landed which had been shipped for the voyage. Thus, in the alternative between flight and resistance, the government, as it were, bound down these eminent men to an opposite condition to that which they had chosen for themselves. Pride, character, and obligation to party and to principle, pledged them so long as they should inhabit the country of their birth, to pursue the course they had begun. Hampden and Cromwell remained—to act probably with very different views; certainly in very different circumstances;—the one to be the first mover of resistance in arms against the power of the king, the other to finally defeat and ruin that power in the field, to overthrow the monarchy, and to drag the sovereign, by whom he was now arbitrarily detained, to a public scaffold."

The fact itself of prohibiting emigrants from passing at the present moment to the rising colony, was no doubt felt by many, and must have been confessed by the nation generally, to be an act of severe oppression, and of unlawful power; it may have had its influence in increasing the sense of public wrong, but its chief influence is to be found in the retention, thereby, of those two great and influential leaders, who were destined to commence and consummate the struggle of the popular cause against the sovereign.

But we must be permitted to add to the observations already made, some few remarks on the state of the press. When the art of printing first commenced, it was comparatively cautious, and slow in the kind of productions it sent forth. Of course the individuals who practised it were few and conspicuous. They had neither the inclination nor the inducement to propagate any thing new or dangerous to existing opinions and institutions. They were men of business and of worldly policy, and, had temptations arisen, would, most likely, have preferred their own interest to the cause either of liberty or knowledge. But things did not long remain in that state. Clandestine printing, and circulating of books had been preceded by the Reformation. The evil produced laws to restrain and curb the liberty of the press, and thus by degress the restriction kept multiplying. Through the reigns of Elizabeth and James various enactments were resorted to, and great severities employed to curb the liberty of pens and insolence of letters. This was one of the special objects intrusted to the surveillance of the commission court; but in spite of all the laws and courts, prohibited books were printed, and,

notwithstanding the required *imprimaturs*, continually appeared without them. Printing presses were worked by invisible hands, and moved from place to place with a rapidity and secrecy which put pursuit and detection at defiance. The success of one such enterprise emboldened others, and towards the period of which we are now treating, a considerable degree of temerity began to prevail. The spirits of men were invigorated by the taste of free discussion, made venturesome by the freedom which they had seen taken with great persons and prohibited subjects, and they now began openly to dare the consequences, and run the risk of large fines, imprisonments, and even the mutilation of their persons, rather than confine their pens within the bounds of privileged inquiry, or submit their productions to the bench of ecclesiastical and royal critics. "I deny not," says Milton, "but that it is of the greatest concernment in the church and commonwealth to have a vigilant eye how books demean themselves, as well as men. For books are not absolutely dead things, but contain a progeny of life in them to be as active as that soul was whose progeny they are. I know they are as lively and vigorously productive as those fabulous dragon's teeth; and being sown up and down, may chance to spring up armed men. And yet, on the other hand, unless wariness be used, as good almost kill a man as kill a book. Many a man lives a burden to the earth, but a good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life." The publication of a book is like the scattering of seed upon the earth. The act might be punished, but could not be superseded. No hand, however potent, could pick up the seed that had once been scattered. The court might have its revenge, but could not prevent the mischief. In fact, the execution of that revenge only tended to make the object of it popular, to excite curiosity after his opinions, and produce an immense aggravation of the very mischief which it was intended to prevent, and which the jealous rulers so much dreaded. Thus it was all through the times of Elizabeth and James. Courts went on punishing authors and prohibiting their books, but freedom of discussion advanced; mind, in its upward ascent, set all restraints at defiance, and—as was perfectly natural under the consciousness of oppression—became violent and abusive, and not unfrequently burst forth into frantic and vulgar ravings. These were no doubt highly disgraceful excesses, but they are partly extenuated, if not wholly pardonable, on account of the unreasonable severity with which free discussion was punished. The reformers had, however, first introduced a sense of mental freedom, and opened to men's eyes the beauty of truth and the charms of knowledge. Every step made in the progress of civil liberty added new attractions to that freedom of social intercourse in its highest department which is carried on by means of books. Thought is common stock; the interchange of it is the commerce of intellectual life; and the more traffickers that are employed in carrying it on, the greater are the gains of the whole. Thus, all feel that they have an interest in that free merchandise which turns to common profit. Monopoly is here an injury to all, even to the monopolist itself; and patents secure no gains. Mankind, therefore, at the period we are reviewing, struggled to realize the rights and interests of truth and reason. Their rulers had long resisted the free interchange of thought—but thought had at length nearly freed itself, when prosecutions, and commission-courts, and

licensors, were all arrayed in vain against a whole nation determined to barter among themselves in the delightful and useful commodities of truth and reason. This resolution on the part of the thinking and reading public was the more formidable, as the chief subjects of their thoughts and debates were religion and politics—the one all engrossing for the present life, the other all-important for the life to come,—the one subject attracting the more active of mankind, the other the more thoughtful. The very means employed by the government to keep down this thirst of knowledge, did but excite and inflame it. Learning had opened her long closed treasuries,—religion courted examination to bring her excellency to the light,—and the whole science and system of civil government presented a mass of good and evil, gold and dross, food and poison, which required the boldest and skilful hand to separate the useful from the worthless, and render it, what it ought always to be, a blessing and an ornament to mankind. At this period, our country either possessed an uncommon measure of genius by the special donation of heaven, or an unusual impulse was given to the human mind. Events acted upon it with a seminataive energy to which our own history, at least, furnishes no parallel. What must have been that state of the public mind which could have called forth from our immortal Milton such a remonstrance against restrictions of the press as the following :

“Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation, rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks : methinks I see her as an eagle nursing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full mid-day beam ; purging and scaling her long-abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance ; while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she means, and in their envious gabble would prognosticate a year of sects and schisms.

“What should we do then ?—Should we suppress all this flowery crop of knowledge and new light sprung up, and yet daily springing up, in this city ?—Should ye set an oligarchy of twenty engrossers over it, to bring a famine upon our minds again, when we shall know nothing but what is measured to us by their bushel ? Believe it, lorde and commons, they who counsel ye to such a suppressing, do as good as bid ye suppress yourselves ; and I will soon show how :—If it be desired to know the immediate cause of all this free writing and free speaking, there cannot be assigned a truer than your own mild, and free, and humane government : it is the liberty, lords and commons, which your own valorous and happy counsels have purchased us ; liberty which is the nurse of all great wits ; this is that which hath rarified and enlightened our spirits like the influence of heaven ; this is that which hath enfranchised, enlarged, and lifted up our apprehensions degrees above themselves. Ye cannot now make us less capable, less knowing, less eagerly pursuing of the truth, unless ye first make yourselves, that made us so, less the lovers, less the founders of our true liberty. We can grow ignorant again, brutish, formal, and slavish, as ye found us ; but you then must first become that which ye cannot be, oppressive, arbitrary, and tyrannous, as they were from whom ye have freed us. That our hearts are now more capacious, our thoughts more erected to the search and expectation of greatest and exactest things, is

the issue of your own virtue propagated in us : ye cannot suppress that, unless ye reinforce an abrogated and merciless law, that fathers may despatch, at will, their own children. Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely, according to conscience, above all liberties."

The nation had passed, from the period of King Charles accession, about seventeen years of anxious but peaceful effort for liberty and reformation, before it was driven to that state of exasperation which emboldened the parliament to defy the royal power. During the whole of this period, knowledge had been increasing, and the spirit of the nation rising. The very prohibitions put upon books served but to whet the edge of appetite. Multitudes had been storing their minds in retirement with those riches of learning which the Reformation had disclosed, and were burning with zeal for the truths they had discovered, or the theories they had formed. Books which could not be published in England were taken over to Holland, there printed, brought back, and privately dispersed. Although it might be thought that by this method their circulation would be exceedingly limited, yet it is certain that it was carried to a much greater extent than can well be imagined. The liberty then enjoyed in that country of discussing freely all questions upon truth and religion, induced many young men of literary habits to pursue their studies there ; and the celebrity of many of the professors in the Protestant universities increased this inducement, and led numerous youths of talent and genius to complete their education in some one of those celebrated schools. These circumstances greatly contributed to increase the thirst for liberty and knowledge, and even to extend the gratification of that appetite beyond the limits which the solicitude of royal and ecclesiastical guardians had prescribed. By these means, in spite of the prohibitory enactments of the State, and the fearful penalties of the star-chamber and commission-court, knowledge had run out into a youthful and vigorous shoot,—free inquiry had dispelled illusions, which time, or law, or power, had long upheld. No checks had been able to suppress the growth of reason, and the exercise of the human faculties upon every subject that can come within the sphere of its observation or its consciousness. But by these means the people had got the start of their governors. The latter had been all along calculating upon the effect of their severe measures to repress the temerity of thought and the boldness of free inquiry—but they were short-sighted in their measures, as well as unobservant of what was silently and clandestinely proceeding. They looked at the supremacy of law,—the maintenance of their own power,—the memorable examples and warnings they had made of all those who had dared openly to contemn their authority ; but all this pertained only to the surface of society. The stream which they had set themselves to impede and to roll back—results which they possibly deemed they were attaining—had only receded from the light, but had formed for itself a subterranean channel, where it was secretly pursuing its course, augmenting its treasures, and preparing to reappear at the favourable conjunction, with all its majestic and fertilizing tide of waters. Mind had become impatient of restraint : it could no longer brook indignities which were wholly undeserved, which had been latterly increasing, and which had now become intolerable ; it was too much to be borne by men of ripe intel-

lect, of profound research, and of prolific and splendid genius, that they should submit every effort of their mind and production of their pen to the decision of an inquisitorial board of critics, perhaps greatly their juniors, and, still more conspicuously, their inferiors in all the accomplishments of composing and estimating books. Was it not a despicable indignity that every production of human talent, no matter how illustrious and rare, should "appear in print like a puny with his guardian, and his censor's hand on the back of his title, to be his bail and surety that he is no idiot or seducer? It cannot be but a dishonour and derogation to the author, to the book, to the privilege and dignity of learning. And as it is a particular disesteem of every knowing person alive, and most injurious to the written labours and monuments of the dead, so to me it seems an undervaluing and vilifying of the whole nation. I cannot set so light by all the invention, the art, the wit, the praise and solid judgment which is in England, as that it can be comprehended in any twenty capacities how good soever; much less that it should not pass except their superintendence be over it, except it be first sifted and strained with their strainers, that it should be uncurrent without their manual stamp. Truth and understanding are not such wares as to be monopolized and traded in by tickets, and statutes, and standards. We must not think to make a staple commodity of all the knowledge in the land, to make and license it like our broad-cloth and our wool-packs. What is it but a servitude like that imposed by the Philistines, not to be allowed the sharpening of our own axes and coulters, but we must repair from all quarters to twenty licensing forges?"

In addition to this proud consciousness of undeserved oppression under which the intellect and genius of the nation was labouring, and which it had long and fearlessly denounced, the jealousy of the trading and mercantile part of the community was keenly provoked by the measures of the government, while a large proportion of those who sympathized neither with the scholar nor the merchant, began to entertain fears, not without reason, that personal liberty was scarcely secure when power was set above law, and when neither thought nor commerce could be free.

Charles during the three and twenty years of his reign, called and dissolved four parliaments, each of which expired under worse circumstances for the power of the king than those under which it met, and each successive one terminated under worse prospects than its predecessor. A brief glance at the proceedings of these parliaments, and at the conduct of the king and his government in reference to them, will prepare the reader to understand the state of things under which the memorable long parliament was assembled, and to judge of the men who were the great agents in establishing the commonwealth. The marriage of Charles with Henrietta, the sister of the king of France, was one of the first circumstances which tended to awaken the jealousies of the nation. The whole of his conduct with regard to it was, to say the least, suspicious. But the toleration of the catholic worship in the queen's court, attended as it was by a retinue of priests, was too obvious an indication to leave any doubts in the minds of anxious protestants as to the policy by which the king's counsels would be governed. No event had produced a more depressing effect on the spirits of British protestants than the conduct of the king with regard to the

French protestants at Rochelle. King James, in prospect of the alliance of his son with Henrietta, had promised the loan of some vessels to be employed by France against Spain. These vessels, the French minister Richelieu contrived to press into the war of persecution then raging against the Hugonots at Rochelle. Charles and his profligate minister readily fell into the plan for the sake of pleasing the court of France. The intrigue however terminated in disgrace and disappointment. One ship of war and seven armed merchant-vessels, were, through the influence of Buckingham, despatched to assist the French government in the siege of that place. On their arrival they were to be filled with French soldiers and marines, and placed under the command of the duke de Montmorency. The announcement of the plan filled the whole crew with mutiny. Admiral Pennington, their commander, declared that he would rather be hanged in England for a disobedience of orders, than fight against his brother-protestants who were contending for their religion and their liberties in France. On his arrival, he resisted alike all menaces and allurements. He resolutely refused to deliver up the ships, and sailed back to the Downs. There the fleet received fresh orders from Buckingham. He pretended that a peace had been concluded between the French king and his protestant subjects. But on returning to Dieppe, the sailors found that they had been deceived. The captains of the merchant-ships protested against the right of the king to dispose of their persons and property, and proposed to sail back again to England, and were restrained only by the admiral firing on them. One of them, however, actually broke through and returned to England. The remaining ships were delivered to the French. All the officers and seamen, however, deserted, and but a single gunner remained to serve against the protestants. This base transaction tended to destroy the confidence of the people of England in their king and his government. No sooner were these transactions known than the commons in parliament showed the same attachment to the protestant religion as the seamen. They proceeded to throw out strong reflections both on the king and his ministry. It formed in their view a fearful omen of the spirit by which the king's counsels would be influenced at home. Of the reasonableness of their fears they soon had sufficient evidence in the administration of their own ecclesiastical affairs. Laud did not hesitate openly to avow his fondness for the old religion. His eagerness to check reform, and to impede innovation, did not stop in neutral or passive measures. It can hardly be said that he betrayed his preference for popery. For he seemed eager to avow it—forward to restore the hated system. His proceedings were characterized by nothing dubious. He did not wait for opportunities, nor play the part of an adept; but at once and fearlessly intimated his hostility to protestant doctrines and practices. The king proved himself but too ready and hearty an accomplice in his designs. Catholic doctrines were openly avouched; overtures for a return to Rome were more than hinted; men were selected for high stations, who were secretly prepared to go all lengths, and who lost no opportunity of forwarding the designs of the court and of the archbishop.

At this period the number of patriots and puritans was so considerable as to render it highly probable that the most determined resis-

tance would be shown even to the royal will itself, should it aim either at a restoration of popery, or an exercise of lawless power. Scarcely had the first parliament met, when the jealousy of the country as to the return of Romanism began to display itself in some proceedings against papists, as well as against several semi-protestants who had stepped forth as their apologists. Then followed the matter of tonnage and poundage,—the adjournment of the parliament to Oxford,—and the withholding of the supplies until some effectual measures should be taken to secure the liberties of the nation and check the abuses of power. Their proceedings were followed up by a declaration of hostility against Buckingham, the king's favourite minister, whom the parliament and the nation equally regarded as the chief instrument of that misrule under which they groaned. A large armament was prepared and sailed from Plymouth, the object of which was to seize a rich Spanish fleet. But after an expensive equipment, and a weak attack upon Cadiz, in which insubordination broke out among the troops, the commander abandoned the enterprize. A cruise was next made towards the Spanish colonies, but the booty they were in search of passed them in the night, and this splendid expedition returned home covered with disgrace and enfeebled by sickness. This occurrence called forth the strongest indignation. At length the duke of Buckingham was impeached a first and then a second time; but after triumphing over his enemies in their attempts upon his power, as if to mortify them the more bitterly, he was made chancellor of Cambridge university. This measure was not accomplished without a sharp struggle. It was at length decided only by a majority of three, and the decision left in the minds of a large body of most influential persons, the impression that the chancellor was obtruded upon them by the weight of royal favour. The patriotic party both in the lords and commons, took a deep interest in the proceeding and received the issue with great indignation. The commons even went so far as to vote this measure an insult upon the feelings of parliament. The dispute between the king and his parliament now became more bitter and obstinate. They deemed that they were contending for the protestant cause, for liberty and law, while the enraged monarch was induced to believe that he was only exerting his just and hereditary prerogatives. The dispute, however, occasioned the greatest embarrassments to the ministry. The reluctance of the commons to grant supplies, induced the king now to adopt the dangerous expedient of a general loan, which was enforced by authority of the council. But the effect of this arbitrary proceeding tended still further to embroil the king with his people. The loan was refused by several eminent and popular characters. This of course led to measures of coercion, to a protracted prosecution, and ultimately to a decision of a majority of the judges in favour of the king's right. Soon after this, and while the king's affairs were in the most perplexing condition at home, he became involved through his late hostility against Spain, in a war with France. The cause of this war is generally attributed to Buckingham. "During a visit to Paris, for the purpose of conducting Henrietta to England, the duke had received the most flattering attention from the court of Louis. The scenes of gaiety prepared in honour of the royal nuptials, were more suited to his taste and capacity than the policy of nations

The favourite of two sovereigns, and the admiration of the most accomplished females in the most polished court of Europe, Buckingham dared to cherish a romantic passion for the queen herself, the youthful Anne of Austria, and even indulged the hope that the guilty-feeling was reciprocal. But his conduct was marked; his subsequent intention to visit the French capital was checked by a message from Louis, which forbade his approach; and the splendid libertine swore that he would see the queen again in spite of all the power of France. From this period he became concerned to produce hostilities between the two crowns, whether from a feeling of resentment merely, or from the hope of being allowed to visit the French court in capacity of ambassador, is uncertain. He first prevailed on Charles to dismiss a number of the queen's attendants, contrary to the articles of the marriage-treaty. He next employed his authority as lord-admiral, in seizing many French vessels under the pretence of their containing Spanish property; and at length appeared before Rochelle, with a fleet of a hundred sail, bearing an army of seven thousand."² Nothing was done however by this fleet and armament. The admiral was obliged to return to England, baffled in his purposes and execrated by his countrymen. After this, two other expeditions were fitted out professedly for the same purpose, but they too failed through the false policy and incapacity of Buckingham.

These circumstances, with many others which must be here passed over, had the most embittering influence on the temper of the third parliament which the king soon after assembled. The measures of the court towards the new house appeared at first to promise conciliation—but the king's speech from the throne soon dissipated the pleasing illusion. The patriots were thrown by it into the most difficult circumstances. It placed them, in case of refusing the required supplies, in a state of direct collision with the king, and in an attitude of open defiance against his authority. The house was clamorous upon the subject of grievances—but still the speeches were characterized by prudence and caution. The most distinguished men declared their loyalty—but insisted on the necessity of redress, and upon the duty of protecting their rights as a house of parliament against encroachment, and of preserving unimpaired the ancient liberties of the subject.

These movements led to the petition of right, which, for a time, the king hesitated to confirm; but, after consulting the judges, and trying to evade it by an ambiguous reply, he at length assented to it. The success of the commons in this measure raised the spirits of the patriots, and revived once more the question of tonnage and poundage, as well as determined them to renew their attack upon Buckingham. But the king cut short all their designs by a prorogation. Although the settlement of the question of tonnage and poundage was thus prevented, and the shield of royal protection thrown around the most infamous minister that ever governed England, yet it is not to be overlooked, that this had been a most invaluable session of parliament to the interests of the nation. "The petition of right, like its illustrious parent, the great charter, might be viewed with jealousy by the sovereign, but with the people it could scarcely cease to be regarded as containing a most

² Vaughan Memorials.

sacred recognition of vital liberties. Like the articles of Runnemede, its provisions might be frequently evaded, and sometimes trodden under foot, but, like those articles, they were not to be forgotten by the nation, whenever called to make a stand against the encroachments of tyranny, under the plea of prerogative." After this followed the fall of Rochelle, viewed by all protestant nations as an indelible disgrace to England. The assassination of Buckingham took place between this deplorable event and the meeting of parliament, otherwise there is little doubt that the wrath of the commons would have brought the career of that profligate and unprincipled minister to its termination. His end made no material alteration in the counsels of the king, or in the relative situation of the conflicting parties. The meeting of parliament was, however, again the signal for renewing the discussion upon tonnage and poundage. After the most disgusting duplicity on the part of Charles, he was constrained to concede the point at issue, and receive his tonnage and poundage by vote of the houses. But having again achieved a victory over their sovereign, they proceeded to demand reparation for those parties who had suffered under the king's illegal demands. The officers of the crown strenuously endeavoured to evade the force of these claims, but finding it impossible to maintain their ground against the voice of the house, they endeavoured to avert, at least for a time, the threatened vengeance, by a prorogation of parliament. Charles, still bent upon maintaining his illegal power, manifested the utmost duplicity respecting the petition of right; and, during the prorogation, caused to be circulated fifteen hundred copies of that petition, with the sophistical answer which had been first given to it by the king, and not with the final assent which had been afterwards obtained. Upon the reassembling of parliament, Sir John Elliot commenced a series of complaints against the servants of the crown, but no sooner had this determined spirit of opposition to the arbitrary measures of the crown, and illegal proceedings of its officers, manifested itself, than another attempt was made to crush all investigation. The speaker rose and announced an order from the king for a second adjournment. But the spirit of the house was now up, and it was impossible longer to suppress the question which had so long embittered the king and the people against each other. When the order for an adjournment was declared, the patriots refused to obey. The doors of the house were immediately locked; and, in the tumult which arose, blows are said to have passed between the opposite parties. Two members, Nolles and Valentine, actually held down the speaker in the chair, until a protest was formed and passed, declaring the abettors of popery, Arminianism, or other opinions opposed to the established church, capital enemies of the State, and which affixed the same stigma upon the man who should advise the taking of the duties called tonnage and poundage, without consent of parliament: a similar declaration was also inserted against him who should consent to pay such claims without an express law. After this bold and intelligible step, the house adjourned till the day mentioned in the royal message.

This untractableness on the part of the commons seems to have brought the unhappy monarch to the resolution of henceforward ruling without parliaments. He accordingly dissolved the present one, and sent forth a proclamation stating his reasons for the step, and caution-

ing all who might be emboldened by the factious conduct of the house of commons, against resisting the royal authority, which was not only of divine right, but would be found sustained by adequate power. The court next proceeded to the violent and imprudent act of imprisoning the leading members of the commons who had opposed the king's measures. This was the turning point of Charles's fate. It evinced his hostility to the privileges of parliament, and his determination to rid himself of their control. When he resolved to unite the legislative and the executive functions in his own person, he had undoubtedly violated the first principles of the constitution, and proclaimed himself a tyrant. The language of his proclamation is intelligible enough,—“We have shown by our frequent meeting our people, our love to the use of parliaments; yet the late abuse having driven us, unwillingly, out of that course, we shall account it presumption for any to prescribe any time unto us for parliaments, the calling, continuing, and dissolving of which is always in our power; and we shall be more inclinable to meet in parliament again when our people shall see more clearly into our interests and actions.”

After this period he seems to have studied retaliation upon his people for the pertinacity of their representatives, and to have sought opportunities for provocation. The most obnoxious persons in the church were preferred to the highest stations. Those who had made themselves odious to the nation, and against whom legal processes had been commenced on account of their popish proceedings within the church, were openly favoured and honoured by the king. Then followed the elevation of Laud, and the exercise of his utmost ability and authority to restore the hated ceremonies, and to assimilate the doctrines and discipline of the church of England to that of Rome. These measures, which were so odious to the people, were accompanied by illegal methods of raising money,—by the exaction of fines upon landholders of forty pounds per annum, who had neglected to accept the honour of knighthood at the king's coronation,—by the revival of what were called the forest laws,—by monopolies,—by abuse of proclamations,—and by the enforcement of ship-money. These public grievances were aggravated still farther by the severe exercise of the power committed to the star-chamber, and which was so fearfully directed against Leighton, Prynne, Bastwick, Burton, and Bishop Williams. The court of high-commission also proceeded to acts of intolerance and cruelty worthy of a Romish Inquisition. Many of the clergy were severely punished by this court. A considerable number of the most diligent and zealous ministers of the church, who found their situation insupportable, determined to withdraw quietly to America. But, as we have seen, even this last resource was denied them, and they were compelled to stay and suffer, until their cruel oppressors roused them to open and general resistance. Laud's hatred of the puritans and of the Geneva doctrine, drove him, about this time, to a measure against foreigners which brought great disgrace upon the government. The French and Dutch protestants resident in England had enjoyed a free toleration of their worship since the days of Edward VI. This liberty had been repeatedly confirmed to them. But Laud now demanded that their children of the second generation should leave the religion of their fathers and become connected with the English church in the parish

where they resided. This intolerance gave great offence, not only to the foreigners and the respective nations to which they belonged, but to all the friends of liberty at home. The archbishop, however, still advanced in his career of hostility against freedom, both in church and state. Calvinism was prohibited, innovations made in the ceremonies of the church, restrictions enforced upon preaching, and afternoon-lectures or sermons forbidden, because they impeded the revels in the evening. The church was manifestly tending to Rome. Great alarm was excited, and not without cause. The catholics were protected and encouraged, and those clergy most advanced who were most popishly inclined, while the puritanical clergy were, throughout the kingdom, exposed to the most oppressive and cruel treatment. At this crisis a union with Rome was projected, and an emissary of the pope actually received at court, though by the king privately. Two of the council proposed and urged the project. The bishop of Chichester assured the Romish emissary, Penzani, that the two archbishops were prepared to submit to the pope,—that there were only three of the English suffragans who were indisposed to the union,—that, as it regarded himself, transubstantiation was his only serious difficulty,—and that a conference of moderate men on both sides would probably bring about such an accommodation as might be desirable for both parties. But the project failed, for Rome would make no compromise.

Thus affairs passed on from step to step, each successive one advancing towards the dreadful crisis which was at hand. The ambition of Laud could not rest while Scotland retained the Genevan doctrine and discipline. It was, therefore, resolved to suppress the presbyterianism of that part of the empire, and substitute episcopacy in its room. The measures deemed necessary for effecting such a project were accordingly taken. But the liberties of an enlightened people were not to be so tamely surrendered. The author of the scheme had ill-calculated his own power of effecting it, and knew little of the temper of the people he wished thus to control. The first reading of the English service-book in Edinburgh was the signal for a tumult, which, spreading with amazing rapidity through Scotland, speedily matured itself into an organized system of resistance. This rebellion was an ominous occurrence to the power of Charles. It was wantonly provoked. Laud appears to have viewed it with utter astonishment and haughty indignation. But by this time the king's resources were greatly impoverished. His hands were tied for want of money. All the illegal exactions he had been able to make had scarcely enabled him to keep up his peace-establishment; but now the urgencies of the government required immediate supply. War in Scotland was to be prepared for, and to obtain the means it was determined to try another parliament. This was the parliament of 1640. When it assembled it proceeded with great caution at first to speak of abuses and breach of privilege; but still insisted upon granting no supplies until the grievances of England were first examined. The most distinguished leaders of the popular cause were Grimstone and Pym. The former said, "The commonwealth hath been miserably torn,—all property and liberty shaken,—the church distracted,—the gospel and the professors of it persecuted, and the whole nation overrun with swarms of projecting canker-worms and caterpillars, the worst of all the plagues of Egypt." The proposal he

submitted was to ascertain at once wherein the petition of right had been violated, and to punish every instrument of its infraction. This speech was followed by several others in the same spirit, but none appears to have so generally carried the sense of the house as that by Mr Pym. They accordingly came to certain resolutions to investigate grievances before granting supplies. After this the king became impatient, and by a message demanded an immediate vote of £850,000. But the message filled the house with murmurs; and, on the following morning, it was dissolved within three weeks of its assembling. The king had formerly indulged his resentment against a refractory house, by committing some of its members to prison, and enforcing a strict search among their private papers, for grounds of impeachment. Both these practices, so inimical to the privilege of parliament, and to personal freedom, were again resorted to. Levies of ship-money were again renewed with increased severity; and every method of raising a revenue, which precedents derived from feudal times might sanction, and even beyond all precedent, was now vigorously employed. These exactions were enforced amidst much tumult in the capital, and with imminent danger to the servants of the crown. The proceedings of the court induced a strong sympathy on the part of the people with the king's northern subjects, who resolutely maintained their opposition to the enforcement of episcopacy. Every effort was tried, but tried in vain, to raise money sufficient for the intended war against the Scots. This measure was the more eagerly pursued, because under pretext of subduing the rebellion of the north, it would afford the means of maintaining the government independently of the public will, and in contempt of those principles of the constitution which restrained the monarchy. The king succeeded so far indeed, as to raise an army; but when embodied, it proved averse to the war, and to an alarming extent, mutinous, and totally unfit for the service. This was not the only difficulty which now beset the king's affairs. The revenues, enforced by all the means which could be made effectual, were found wholly inadequate to the requisite equipments. The failure of these measures proved, therefore, a signal argument of the weakness of the king's power, and an ominous presage of the fearful crisis which his own obstinacy was every day hastening. In this alarming state of affairs, he fell upon an expedient which was designed to avert the necessity for calling another parliament, but which only served to enforce it imperatively upon him. A council of peers was summoned to meet at York, the majority of whom, when they were assembled together with ten thousand of the citizens of London, petitioned for a parliament, as the only means of restoring tranquillity, and of settling the differences between the crown and the people. This event, therefore, left Charles no option. He had been taken in his own snare, and however disagreeable to his feelings, and inimical to his plans, he was literally obliged to submit to the will of the nation, and call a new parliament. This last parliament, which proved the rock of Charles's destruction, and the bulwark of British liberties, has been since generally known by the name of the *long parliament*. The session opened with the renewed statement of grievances both in church and state. The leaders of the popular party were men of great ability, and of highly patriotic feelings. Their first proceedings were conducted with much tem-

per and decorum. But unhappily conciliation and reform were as unpalatable as ever to the infatuated monarch.

This parliament was from its commencement remarkable for one fact, which deserves to be specially noted. The speeches of the members were now, for the first time, made public. These were printed and circulated to a great extent through the whole kingdom,—a practice which has since been attended with the most auspicious influence upon the administration of public affairs. The effect was soon manifest in the conduct of the two houses. The country was filled with complaints, which led to petitions and various other proceedings, all tending to bring to general notoriety the illegal practices of the king's government. The condemnation of these oppressions was loud and universal. In fact, no one ventured to defend them, while the parliament felt themselves daily growing stronger, both in the determination and in the ability to make a final stand against the encroachments of an unconstitutional power.

They first proceeded to restore a great number of the clergy who had been silenced, imprisoned, and deprived; and subsequently formed a committee for the punishment of immoral and scandalous ministers. Several of the bishops, who had shown themselves zealous in promoting popish ceremonies, and in persecuting the puritanical clergy, were next exposed to the resentment of the commons. The earl of Strafford was impeached for high treason. His seizure and commitment were managed with great spirit and firmness by the parliament. Laud, whose oppressions had been perhaps the most severe and heavy, was next impeached, and committed to the Tower. But while the commons were thus resolute in crushing the power of the king's evil advisers, they applied themselves with great firmness to regulate the exercise of that authority under which money had been extorted from the subjects of the empire contrary to law. They proscribed monopolies,—fixed the boundaries of the royal forests,—abolished the feudal custom of compulsory knighthood,—put an end to the impressment of soldiers for foreign service,—declared the imposition of tonnage and of poundage, without consent of parliament, illegal,—condemned the exaction of ship-money, and reversed the sentence of the star-chamber against Hampden. Their next measure was the bill for triennial parliaments, which completely crushed the hopes the king had too evidently entertained, of reigning without them. His consent to this bill was not given, as may be well-imagined, without great reluctance. Its consummation was celebrated by the people with every demonstration of enthusiastic joy. The most pernicious engines of arbitrary power, under which the nation had long and extensively suffered, were the courts of star-chamber and high-commission. These, after a severe struggle, this memorable parliament succeeded in abolishing, completely and for ever. The trial and death of Strafford followed soon after. Charles endeavoured, about this time, to carry into execution a design to overawe the parliament by the presence of the army, and many of the patriots were thrown by it into a state of serious alarm. Some considerable reaction was unquestionably created in favour of the royal cause, through the reasonable fears which moderate men began to feel, lest the growing power of the commons should become supreme. The city received and entertained the king, while some of

the patriots began to differ in opinion with their companions, and to fear lest opposition to the royal power should subvert the monarchy. This, however, only tended ultimately to increase the anxiety of the popular party, and to urge them hastily forward to more decisive and peremptory steps, while they yet held the power in their hands. They accordingly introduced, and in three days passed a bill which made parliaments equally independent both of the sovereign and of the popular will. The bill declared that the present parliament should not be dissolved without its own consent. It was followed up by a *remonstrance* which evinced the determination of the house to leave the liberties of the nation no longer in the hands of the monarch. It was even urged that the command of the army should not henceforth be vested in the king, but be transferred to the parliament. That this proposal should have been resisted to the utmost, is no way wonderful. It was an unconstitutional encroachment, though apparently rendered necessary by the temper of the king, and the alarming dangers that impended. Things now grew to such a height of violence, that the bishops, as a body, finding they could not without risk of personal danger, occupy their places in the house of peers, sent in a protest against the transaction of all public business during their absence. This imprudent act did but inflame the popular animosity to a higher pitch. Their conduct was voted to be an assumption of the royal prerogative, and they were in consequence impeached for high treason. Several of them were committed to the Tower, and the king was obliged to give his assent to a bill which excluded them from their seats. In consequence of the prevalence of various rumours, that the patriots intended next to impeach the queen, his majesty seems to have determined that he would be before hand with them, and, in consequence, instructed the attorney-general to institute a charge of high treason against five of the commons;—Pym, Hampden, Holles, Haselrig, and Bond, and against Lord Kimbolton. The house resisted the demand to deliver up the impeached members, but assured the king of the due attendance of the parties. The following day, however, he came to the house in person followed by soldiers. Failing in his attempt to seize the persons demanded, he was constrained to retire amidst loud murmurs of ‘Privilege! privilege!’ The parliament adjourned for a week, and on its reassembling, armed bodies of men appeared to protect the popular members, and Hampden in particular was escorted to the house by strong bodies both of horse and foot. The king retired to Hampton court, sensible, it is said, of his rash step, and convinced of the necessity of conciliation. But his rashness had emboldened both the people and their leaders. The parliament claimed the control of the army and navy; which, after much altercation, they in effect obtained, though with some restriction. The opposite parties now used every exertion by papers and proclamations to rouse the kingdom respectively in their cause. Charles commenced a journey to York, and made an unsuccessful attempt to seize Hull and its magazine of warlike stores. But the parliament had placed it under the command of Sir J. Hotham, who effectually resisted the king’s attempt, made in violation of his recent compact with the parliament. It now became obvious that the sword could alone decide the quarrel. This act of the king removed all doubt of his purpose, and justified the parliament in providing for

its own defence, and for the preservation of the peace and liberties of the kingdom. Preparations were promptly made for war.

Nineteen articles were submitted to the king, as the basis of a settlement; but these were all unacceptable, especially the one relating to the possession of the militia. The queen had said, "Keep the militia, that will bring back every thing." Charles thought with Henrietta on this point, and, in reply to this demand, exclaimed, "*By God, not for an hour!*" The town of Portsmouth was the first under the advice of its governor to declare for the king's cause, and to resist the authority of the parliament. The earl of Essex, who had been made the general of the parliamentary forces, was ordered to lay siege to the place. This was followed by a royal proclamation, denouncing the earl and his men as traitors, and ordering them to return to their duty within six days. The parliament, in their turn, denounced the king's proclamation a libel, and declared all who advised or approved it, guilty of treason. In a few days the king raised his standard at Nottingham—which was understood by both parties to import a declaration of war.

A battle was soon after fought at Edgehill, the issue of which remained doubtful. Both armies claimed the victory, but neither was yet in a situation to induce the other to submit. The king drew large reinforcements from several of the midland counties, while the metropolis and its environs recruited the popular cause with many additional regiments. The king, however, advanced to Oxford, being greatly encouraged by the nobility of the kingdom and by the university of that place. It is not necessary to go over the recital of events that followed. Negotiations were several times set on foot, but broken up. Sometimes one party seemed to gain the ascendancy and then the other; but, during the struggle, both were doubtless guilty of much obstinacy and violence. Divisions and party-interests prevailed at times to weaken and discourage both sides, until, at length, Cromwell arose to lead the cause of the people, and put an end both to the deadly contention and to the hopes of monarchy. Many battles had been fought with various success. After the elevation of Cromwell to the command, the parliamentary army was new modelled under his direction. In June, 1645, the king's troops were overtaken near Harborough in Leicestershire. The royalists had ridiculed the new model, and nicknamed it *the new noddle*. But a battle was now fought which completely evinced the superiority of the new arrangements and new commanders, and at once overthrew all the hopes of the cavaliers. The battle of Naseby was unquestionably decided by the valour of Cromwell, and the troops under his command. The royal army was large and high-spirited, but it lost that day five thousand men and nineteen thousand stand of arms, the whole of the artillery and baggage, together with the king's private papers, which materially served the cause of his enemies. This battle may be said to have decided the conflict in the field. All the king's following measures merely consisted of a series of ill-advised steps, which served to extinguish all hopes of accommodation, to make his duplicity more conspicuous than ever, and to raise the most violent of his enemies to that pitch of power which placed the preservation even of his person completely out of the hands of those moderate men, who would have proved his defence, had he availed himself of the many opportunities which were afforded for a sincere pacification. But, fallen

as he was, he refused to treat honourably for his restoration. His advisers buoyed him up to the last with hopes of outwitting or of crushing his opponents. The certain consequence of his insincerity was the further alienation of moderate opponents, and the thrusting forward in the popular cause of the most violent spirits, who generally proved men of too much ability and subtilty not to avail themselves of all his mistakes, and turn them to their ultimate project of extinguishing monarchy, and of setting up a republic in its place. This project could not, however, be effected while the king remained alive, and while the hopes of his party had a single point around which they might rally, and by which they might be kept alive. Suffice it to say, that the king became at last completely entangled in the toils which his own precipitation and obstinacy had provided, and in which he fell passively into the hands of his enemies, who soon contrived and executed the apparently plausible and practicable scheme of his trial and death. The principal actors in this fearful scene had eagerly seized at the prospect of effecting for the nation the entire riddance of one set of troubles, but had evidently not familiarized themselves with the entirely new class of difficulties which such a step would create. They, in their turn, involved themselves before they were aware, in perplexities far greater and more perilous to the liberties of the nation than those through which they had fought their way against arbitrary rule.

Within a week after the execution of the king, the monarchy, and with it the house of peers, were both abolished, and a council of forty appointed to assume the executive government. The requisite alterations were made in the oath of allegiance, in the great seal, and in the administration of justice. But the reign of arms had commenced, and the house of commons was no longer a representation of the people. From five hundred it was reduced to fifty members. The remainder soon saw that the present state of things could not be long upheld. They, thereupon, resorted to the expedient of inviting some of the expelled members to return, and of issuing new writs for the election of others. Still, after the house was thus recruited, it bore but little of the semblance of a true representation, although it was increased by these means to about one-third of its original number. The authority which it possessed was anything but firm, and the character of usurpation was so visibly impressed upon all its proceedings that it evidently distrusted itself. This usurpation was the more odious and insecure, because it rested upon no basis but that of military power. Yet, perilous as this situation of affairs was, it seemed preferable to that preponderance which, in case of its failure, must have been given, either to the episcopalians or the presbyterians—the one full of wrath, the other not less full of bigotry and intolerance. The army, moreover, was split into factions; and it was owing exclusively to the firmness and promptitude of Cromwell, that the country was not wasted by mutinous detachments that continually broke off in different directions, and assumed threatening attitudes. Ireland, also, was at this period the scene of much confusion and rebellion, and the cause of the surviving Charles Stuart soon excited the loyalty of the Scots, and cut out new work for the genius and enterprise of the great general of the time. He was, however, in all respects, a man fitted for the scenes which arose around him. By the battle of Dunbar he gave a final blow to

the insurrection of the Scots, and, by that of Worcester, he completely overthrew the new attempts of the royalists. These two events, as Mr Hallam has remarked, "more than any deep-laid policy, had brought sovereignty within the reach of Cromwell."

The army returned to London, successful in Ireland, Scotland, and England—but it returned to become the instrument of establishing the republic, and of placing Cromwell at its head. The pacification of the kingdom was now urged by a considerable party as a reason for diminishing the army. But the general contrived to frustrate the measure; and when it appeared difficult any longer to defer it, he allowed a deputation of officers to present a petition to the house, complaining of many unredressed grievances, and reflecting severely on the conduct of parliament. This led to a remonstrance from Whitelocke, in which he pointed out the impropriety, not the illegality, of suffering men, in the capacity of soldiers, and under arms, to petition a legislative assembly. The remonstrance was listened to by Cromwell, and in the conversation that followed, he expressed his difficulty in discovering some third power that might intervene between the army and the parliament, whose collision he professed to fear. Whitelocke proposed an adjustment of the difficulties, by entering into a private treaty with Charles Stuart, by which the liberties of the country might be secured and his excellency remain at the head of the army.

"It is certain this scheme did not commend itself to Cromwell. Why it did not, is a point on which his adversaries find no difficulty in deciding. His hesitation to act on the advice of Whitelocke resulted purely, it is said, from his own selfish ambition. But to calmer men, it has appeared to flow from the cause Cromwell himself assigns, a conviction that Charles Stuart could not forget the shedding of his father's blood, and that his return, under any conditions, would lead to an overthrow of whatever the war had effected, and to a summary disposal of the men who had been most efficient in conducting it."

Soon after this conference, he dissolved the parliament by a violent act of military power, and dismissed the council of state in as summary a way. These proceedings completely alienated that numerous and influential body, which had been striving for a length of time, and through many difficulties, to establish the presbyterian discipline. But, by conciliatory measures, he secured the confidence and the affections of a large proportion of the people. To Scotland he extended a much freer toleration than had ever before been there known; and although the public exercise of the catholic worship, and of the episcopal liturgy, was prohibited, yet it is manifest the grounds of this exception consisted rather in political than in religious reasons. Such episcopalians, however, as abstained from seditious interference with the government, were allowed to continue their forms of worship without molestation. It became evident to all men that the power of the protector depended wholly upon the army. This state of affairs, therefore, led to much disaffection, and tended to enforce upon him the necessity of calling another parliament. Its assembling led to proceedings by no means agreeable to his feelings, and he therefore soon dissolved it, and issued what was called *The Instrument of Government*. This act vested him with no power but what the abrogated constitution conferred upon the sovereign, as the head of the executive. It pro-

posed to call a new parliament, which was decreed to be the seat of sovereignty, and upon whose acts the protector was to have no negative voice. It vested only a temporary power in Cromwell, till the senate should assemble, and exercise its sovereign authority. It included a clause on liberty of conscience, and was as favourable to the exercise of free worship as perhaps the state of the country would allow.

The elections, however, sent a considerable body of presbyterians and of republicans to parliament. The whole house consisted of four hundred members. But it had no sooner assembled than new contention arose between the opposite parties that composed it. All the articles of the late instrument were made matter of sharp debate, and the one in particular that related to the executive power of the protector was negated when put to the vote. At this juncture, Cromwell interfered, and prohibited the discussion of four points laid down by the instrument; these were, that the government should be by a single individual, as opposed to a republic,—that he should have command of the forces,—that parliament should not be perpetual,—and that liberty of conscience should be granted to all persons conducting themselves as peaceable subjects. To enforce their submission to these conditions, he placed a guard at the door of the house, which, on the return of the members from the painted chamber, was ordered to exclude all who refused to sign these articles. About one-fourth of the house was thus deprived of their seats, and when the remainder proposed to make the office of protector elective, he became violently enraged, and suddenly dissolved the assembly. These proceedings excited the strongest indignation throughout the country, and would inevitably have produced the overthrow of his authority, had it not been strongly fortified by military power,—and had he not checked the augmenting disaffection by a timely and popular interference in favour of the persecuted Vaudois, and by a vigorous foreign policy, which raised the spirits of the nation, and greatly contributed to replace it in that proud position it had formerly occupied as the head of protestant Europe. But this commanding station was not to be maintained without a large army, and a still more formidable navy; and these could not be sustained without taxes, and taxes could not be collected without an appearance, at least, of lawful imposition. This, consequently, led to the summoning of a third parliament. Notwithstanding the use of very unjustifiable means to influence the elections, nearly a hundred were declared, by the authority of the protector and council, to be ineligible, on the charge of moral and political delinquencies.

The first subject which agitated this new parliament, was the power of the council to exclude the disaffected members; but, in this point, the majority decreed in favour of the protector and the council. The subsequent acts of this assembly contributed to succour the tottering power of Cromwell. A motion was soon introduced that he should take upon him the government, according to the ancient constitution. This proposal therefore intended, that he should at once take upon him the style and title of king. But this proposal was by no means agreeable to many of his best friends, and to the leading officers of his army, and he, in consequence, declined it. In doing so, however, he was evidently determined by the decided conduct of his friends. A new plan of government was now adopted, which vested the supreme power

in the protector, with the privilege of nominating a successor,—re-established the two houses of parliament,—defined and limited the rights of judicature,—gave to the house of commons the power to determine the qualification of its own members,—and established many other regulations calculated to secure harmony among the different branches of the government, and especially tending to a settlement of religious differences. The two houses met—but the result of the newly acquired power of the commons to decide upon elections, was soon exerted to call in those who had been excluded by the protector's council. The opposition set themselves also immediately to overthrow the new house of peers, and plans were formed for abolishing the protectorate. Besides these alarming signs, the army and navy required large grants, in order to clear off arrears of pay, due both in England and Ireland.

In this situation of affairs, Cromwell appears to have been reduced to the necessity of again dissolving parliament. His enemies expected that this act would at once lead to the overthrow of his power, by rendering him utterly odious. But he foresaw, that a desertion of his dangerous and difficult position would immediately bring several powerful parties into a state of open collision,—and though his last efforts to restore the ancient constitution had failed through the violence of these parties in parliament, yet he still felt himself, out of doors, quite capable of competing with them, whether by open violence or by hidden subtlety.

Henceforth, therefore, he continued, for the seven months of his life which followed the dissolution of the last parliament, to combat the designs of the several parties who were continually plotting against his life and government. Still it is manifest, that his hopes always tended to a peaceful and constitutional settlement of the nation. He had seized the helm in a moment of imminent peril, and he knew not how to quit it afterwards, without incurring as great or greater dangers to the vessel than those out of which he steered it.

An authority that would never have yielded to him more than his due, has said, “when he shed blood, it was never for the appetite of blood; such acts were committed by him against a good nature, not in indulgence of a bad one.” It is added, “his good sense and his good nature would have led him to govern equitably and mercifully, to promote literature, to cherish the arts, and to pour wine and oil into the wounds of the nation.” “No man was so worthy of the station which he filled, had it not been for the means by which he reached it. He would have governed constitutionally, mildly, mercifully, liberally, if he could have followed the impulses of his own heart, and the wishes of his better mind; self-preservation compelled him to a severe and suspicious system: he was reduced at last to govern without a parliament, because, pack them and purge them as he might, all that he summoned proved unmanageable; and because he was a usurper, he became, of necessity, a despot.”² He died on the 3d of Sept. 1658. His significant words often were, “they would bring all into confusion again.” It was his commanding genius that had alone prevented it: but his death was the signal of hope for which many parties had been

² Quarterly Review, XXV.

waiting. Richard, his son, was declared protector, and many congratulatory addresses were presented to him. But it was necessary to summon a parliament to secure supplies for the army. A parliament was assembled, but was soon found to be inimical to that military rule which was now taking the power out of the hands of the protector. Richard was, therefore, constrained by the officers to dissolve the house. He had no sooner effected this, than he found himself completely in the power of the army, who determined upon recalling that remnant of a parliament which Oliver had expelled, and which, on account of its reduced state, was known by the name of 'The Rump.' The military officers pledged themselves to support this assembly. But when it was found, even by this fragment of a house of commons, that the military were for constituting themselves an independent power in the State, the opposition became loud and general, and the military, therefore, again dispersed them by the bayonet. Thus, again, all power relapsed into the hands of the army.

Richard may be said to have deposed himself when he dissolved his parliament, and soon after actually resigned his office in form. General Monk, who was at this time in Scotland, favoured the cause of the expelled house of parliament, and by his conduct and letters fostered the determination of resisting a military government. Monk began to advance towards London, and arrived there by slow marches. The rump parliament was again assembled. It required his adherence to the exclusion of the Stuarts,—but this requisition he contrived to evade. He was then ordered to act against the city, but after some little show of obedience, he declared in favour of that party which had called for a parliament formed upon the fundamental laws of the kingdom. Soon after, those members were restored who had been excluded a short time before the death of the king. Thus, the 'long parliament' was revived, and the presbyterians once more gained the ascendancy over the republicans. But this parliament continued only a few weeks, when it was dissolved by its own consent, and another formed, which received the denomination of the 'Convention parliament.' When it assembled, it was found to contain a large proportion of royalists. Monk, whose proceedings had hitherto been impenetrably secret, now ventured openly to avow the cause of the exiled Charles Stuart. He boldly proposed his return, and the re-establishment of the ancient *regime*. There were some patriots who still urged the necessity of improving the present situation of affairs to obtain at least a full adjustment of the powers and rights of the crown, and a clear recognition of the liberties of the people: but the general would hear of no delay,—he threw every impediment in the way of such a discussion as might ensue upon these questions, and insisted that the king might be quite as advantageously treated with after his arrival as before. Thus, the voice of one man now availed to undo all that had been effected during twenty years, by the protracted struggles and sufferings of a whole kingdom. Reason and patriotism were utterly lost sight of amidst the exulting triumphs of the cavaliers.

It is impossible to review the events of this extraordinary era without observing the astonishing display of talent which marked it in almost every department. Notwithstanding the extravagancies which deformed many of the religious parties, and the violence of feeling which seemed

to embitter many of them against each other—yet it must be confessed that their imperfections were lost amidst the blaze of general excellence by which they were distinguished. Their love of liberty was pure and intense, and however inauspiciously their struggles terminated, even for the favourite objects which prompted them: yet no one can consider calmly the situation of the country when those struggles commenced, or the character of the public men and measures against which they were directed, without admitting that the object was noble, and the quarrel just. The kingly power had often been unduly stretched. Charles perhaps did not aim at any new encroachments, until the resistance of his people drove him to support his power by lawless means. Yet his error lay in not perceiving the changes which the Reformation had introduced into men's views, both of religion and politics.

Government must be an apparatus always regulated by a regard to the intellectual, as well as to the external and physical, circumstances of men. The management applied to a machine will not do for a horse; and that applied to a child will not do for men; neither will that which is adapted to men under one set of circumstances apply to them when they are presented under another set of circumstances. It is the proper business of governors to observe the changes in mankind which require answerable changes in the system by which they are to be held in a peaceful and useful community. Such alterations society in almost all nations has undergone, and such, it seems, destined to undergo, as long as the human mind is susceptible of improvement. Who could wish to see his species stationary, or reconcile himself to that which is—not because it is the best, but because it is established; and yet it may happen, that changes for the better are not always desirable. There is frequently a risk attending innovations. Their eligibility should be viewed in the combined light of the greater good to be obtained by them, and the inconvenience that may result from their adoption. Mr Godwin has well-observed on the era of which we treat: "Changes in the political government and constitution of a country, will, by men of a humane and conscientious temper, be proposed with caution, and be endeavoured to be executed with wariness and moderation. But when important alterations are absolutely required, those persons are scarcely to be censured, who, in the improvement they meditate, should carry forward their thoughts to the best, to that system which will operate in a way the most auspicious to moral courage and social virtue. England can hitherto scarcely be said to have exhibited any political state that could excite the partiality and attachment of an enlarged and reflecting mind. Under the feudal system, the lords only had a species of equality and power, while the cultivators of the soil were slaves. When that system declined, the wars of York and Lancaster succeeded; and it was difficult to say, what party would finally prove the stronger, in the close of that universal embroilment and confusion. In point of fact, the ascendancy of the Tudors followed; and, though there then existed among us many of the elements and materials of freedom, the administration was for the most part despotic. It needs no great stretch of fairness and penetration to make us to say, whether the government of the first two Stuarts was such, as a true friend of man would have wished to see revived and perpetuated. Charles—so the firmest and most masculine spirits of the age pronounced—had forfeited

his title to the crown of a free people. He was a lover of arbitrary power, (we will not lay much stress upon that;) he had shown himself, in a variety of instances, a man, whose engagements and protestations were no way to be relied on. He had waged war upon the representative body, delegated by the nation; nothing could extinguish the hostility of his spirit; he had applied himself to arm his partizans in every part of the empire, the Catholics of Ireland, and hiring forces from every quarter of the world, to work his will upon the nation. It is not a light thing for a sober and magnanimous people willingly to place at their head, and endow with royal prerogatives, a man who for successive years had shed their blood in the field, and sought to subdue their resistance and their courage.

“Another consideration, most material in the case, was the passion of the great majority of the nation for religious reform, and the aversion with which they regarded the said hierarchy. Surely, if change, if a new system can be commendable, a more favourable opportunity could not have offered itself. The commonwealth men were earnest to try of what stuff their countrymen were made, and whether, as Montesquieu says, they had virtue enough to fit them for, and to sustain a popular government. The master-spirits of this time were not contented with the idea of a negative liberty, that should allow every man to obey the impulse of his own thoughts, and to use his power of body and mind as he pleased: they aspired to a system and model of government, that was calculated to raise men to such excellence as human nature may afford, and that should render them magnanimous, frank, benevolent, and fearless—that should make them feel, not merely each man for himself, and his own narrow circle, but as brethren, as members of a community, where all should sympathize in the good or ill-fortune, the sorrows or joys, of the whole.”

If, after being so long oppressed by the iron grasp of civil and ecclesiastical domination, men fell into an opposite extreme of licentiousness, it is not more than might be expected. Their determination to try the benefits of a republic was perfectly reasonable in their circumstances, and only shows how utterly odious monarchy had rendered itself. The men who sympathized in these plans and movements, were men of whom, in all other respects, supposing this to have been an error, their nation and their species have reason to be proud. They were the ablest jurists, the most powerful reasoners, the most accomplished senators, and altogether the most distinguished philanthropists their country ever produced. Even the usurper himself was every way worthy of being the prince of a great nation. For, after all the shades of his character, and all the daring acts of administration, there is no solid ground to impeach either his patriotism or the wisdom of his views. His misfortune was, that he was placed amidst jarring elements that he could not reconcile, yet felt that he must control. His most questionable acts were forced upon him from the circumstances of the time, and from a fear of greater evils, while the imperfections and errors of his character were less those of the man than of the age. When we regard the influence of his measures upon the internal prosperity and external interests of the nation, it is impossible not to perceive how much he excelled most of the princes who have ever wore the crown and swayed the sceptre of these realms. Even the short and anxious period through which he

held the reins of government, and which scarce sufficed for any measure but such as was defensive and conservative, is a bright and joyous interval compared with the reign which preceded, and with that which followed it,—a calm morning of refreshing and cheering brightness contrasted with the dark night of oppression and cruelty which it followed, or with the licentious and profligate levity of that which it preceded. All historians agree, that under his protection commerce flourished greatly,—the army and navy were raised to a pitch of efficiency and of discipline which they never before possessed,—the external possessions of the country were increased by most valuable acquisitions,—and the influence of the nation among the courts of Europe raised to a height it had never known before. If ever England's foreign operations were regulated by a spirit of magnanimity and of patriotism, it was during his protectorate.

Much has been said by some writers, determined at any rate to blacken his memory, concerning his want of taste and learning. Hume has not even hesitated to denominate him a barbarian. But no charge was ever more unjust. He made no pretensions indeed to scholarship, but he was neither insensible to its value nor indifferent to its claims upon his patronage. The man who, amidst all his attention to public affairs, and all the agitation and anxiety of the period through which he ruled, could select Milton and Marvel for his secretaries,—cause a survey to be taken, and maps to be constructed of the whole kingdom of Ireland,—patronize and assist so great a work as the Polyglot of Walton,—bestow a pension upon Bishop Usher,—endow a professorship at Oxford,—purchase Usher's valuable library to prevent its falling into the hands of foreigners, and present it to Dublin university,—buy rare manuscripts for the Bodleian library,—regulate the discipline of both the universities, so that at the Restoration they were found in a more orderly state, and richer in learned and eminent scholars than at any former period of their history,—erect and endow a college at Durham, the very design which has laid dormant till the present age, when it is again revived,—surely the man who could accomplish so much in the short space of eight or nine years of commotion and political strife, scarcely deserves to be branded with the name of a barbarian. It had been well for Great Britain if all her crowned heads had done as much for the interests of learning and religion.

The prominent vice of this extraordinary man had been engendered by his success, and is the usual accompaniment of human greatness. His ambition tarnished his patriotism, and betrayed him into systematic manœuvring and artifice. For several years prior to his death, the prospect of easily attaining kingly power seems to have allured him at once into a slippery and a thorny path. Undoubtedly the love of rule had been progressively mastering his better principles and feelings. The forcible dispersion of the long parliament, the assembling and dismissing of other parliamentary assemblies, the dictation of the form of government which he resolutely assumed, together with the frequent changes that he made in the principles which were to guide the legislative body, all seem to have prepared the way, perhaps were designed to prepare it, for grasping at last the regal sceptre, and assuming the forms and titles of majesty: though perhaps, in justice to him, we ought to admit that he would have abjured arbitrary rule as soon as he could have seen the

several powers of the constitution once again righted. There can be no doubt that he had abandoned all ideas of a republic as visionary and impracticable; and that he saw the necessity of reverting to the ancient theory of the constitution. Only, he wished the third estate of the realm to be found in himself; and who can wonder, when he seemed, both by nature and by circumstances, made for it, and, by his services, to have deserved it? His last parliament appears to have been called, we might say packed, for the purpose of completing this final project of his ambition. But, in a great measure, he overlooked the fact that the times had created more heroes than himself; and that though he might be the Cæsar of his country, that country could supply many a Brutus, who would be found to love his country above his best friend. When Cromwell had designed to make his last parliament subservient to his project of becoming king, he committed an oversight which is not wonderful, considering how blind and rash ambition generally is. The sanction of another powerful body was as essential to his success, as the pliancy of his parliament. A committee of the house was appointed to enforce his acceptance of the crown, under the form of a petition. But the body, still more important to the practicability of the measure, was composed of the officers of his army. Among the first of these was General Fleetwood his son-in-law, and Colonel Desborough his brother-in-law. Their favour Cromwell soon saw was essential to his success, yet they were sternly adverse to the step. Nothing could shake their resolution. He had actually appointed the house to meet him on the ensuing morning for the purpose of receiving his assent to their proposition, when the combination of these two officers, with Dr Owen and Colonel Pride, completely frustrated his purpose, and induced him to assume an air of great self-denial in declining the regal pomp and power which the parliament had urged him to accept. There can be no doubt that his mind was ambitious and his dominion usurped, but all parties are now pretty well agreed that his principles of government were enlightened and liberal, and that had he been secure from plots of assassination and secret conspiracies, his administration would not only have been mild and patriotic, but free from those charges of arbitrary and lawless acts for which there is ample ground indeed, but which were all forced upon him by the hostility of the extreme parties on either hand. Of the excellent effects of his government, both upon the interests and the virtue of the people, his enemies have borne witness. It is not a little remarkable, that several of those writers who were the most averse both to his religious and political principles, have left us the most honourable and the most satisfactory, because the most unimpeachable testimonies, to the excellent manner in which he conducted both the domestic and foreign affairs of the kingdom. Mr Eachard, an undoubted adversary of Cromwell, and of the principles which led to his elevation, says, that the protector having waded through all these difficulties to the supreme government of these nations, appeared on a sudden, like a comet or blazing star, raised up by providence to exalt this nation to a distinguished pitch of glory, and to strike terror into the rest of Europe; that his management for the little time he survived, was the admiration of mankind,—for, though he would never suffer his title to the supreme government to be disputed, yet his greatest enemies have confessed, that in all other cases distributive justice was restored to its ancient splendour;

that the judges did their duty according to equity, without covetousness or bribery, the laws had their full and free course without impediment or delay, men's manners were wonderfully reformed, and the protector's court was under an exact discipline; that trade flourished, and the arts of peace were cultivated throughout the whole nation, the public money was managed with frugality, and to the best advantage, the army and navy were well paid, and served accordingly; that, as the protector proceeded with great steadiness and resolution against the enemies of his government, he was no less generous and bountiful to those of all parties who submitted to it,—for, as he would not declare himself of any particular sect, he gave out that it was his only wish that all would gather into one sheep-fold, under one shepherd, Jesus Christ, and love one another; that he respected the clergy in their places, but confined them to their spiritual functions. Nor was he jealous of any that did not meddle in politics, and endeavour to raise a disturbance in the state; even the prejudice he had against the episcopal party, (says Bishop Kenneth,) was more for their being royalists, than being of the church of England; but, he adds, when one party of the clergy began to lift up their heads above their brethren, or to act out of their sphere, he always found means to take them down: he had a watchful eye over the royalists and republicans, who were always plotting against his person and government. Dr Welwood also compares the protector to an unusual meteor, which, with its surprising influences, overawed not only three kingdoms, but the most powerful princes and states about us. “A great man he was, (says Dr W.) and posterity might have paid a just homage to his memory if he had not imbrued his hands in the blood of his prince, and trampled upon the liberties of his country.” This latter charge is, however, not well-sustained, for what he did which deserves this character seems to have been in a great measure, if not wholly, justified by the violence of those irreconcilable parties which would have effectually impeded and overthrown any constitutional government, and have kept the kingdom for years longer in a state of fearful anarchy. To repress the extreme tendencies to absolute monarchy and hated episcopacy on the one hand, and the ultra-republicanism and irreligion on the other, he was necessitated to resort to acts, which in a more settled state of the country would have been utterly unjustifiable. It is therefore not wonderful, that his character has been handed down to us under many disadvantageous colourings and distortions, as if tyranny and arbitrary rule had been his choice, not his exigency,—his ultimate aim, not the temporary expedient which the crisis forced upon him. It is always to be borne in mind, when we examine his conduct, that the several factions of royalists, republicans, and presbyterians, all viewed him with disgust, because he would adopt the principles of neither party, but endeavoured to amalgamate the principles of the whole, and to restore as far as possible, the ancient constitution divested of those imperfections which had attended its administration, and with effectual checks to those abuses of power which would have resulted from a return to unlimited monarchy, or the establishment of a pure republic. Each party had hoped to find in him the instrument for establishing their favourite theories in politics and in religion; and each of these parties, be it remembered, consisted of exclusives. They were disappointed and enraged to see the supreme

power wrested from them, and employed for the protection of their opponents. But his decision and management, yea, the very unconstitutional power that he exerted, was directed against the supremacy and domination of any one set of principles, and formed a decisive proof of his wisdom and moderation, as well as of his consummate ability. He was imperiously called to hold the helm in the most stormy and perilous season England had ever witnessed, when to hesitate would have been like to have thrown his country back again into the arms of despotism, both in church and state, or to have abandoned it to the cruel fangs of civil strife. The parties were so embittered, their opposite principles so mutually intolerant, and their power so nearly balanced, that a long and disastrous contention must have ensued, and would probably have terminated in the ascendancy of extreme views on the one side or the other. But his wisdom and valour contrived to keep them all in check, and ultimately to rescue both himself and the commonwealth from shipwreck. His conduct of affairs was the admiration of all men. Even those who condemned the principles on which he acted applauded the tendencies and the results of his energy, moderation and justice. The most distinguished geniuses were inspired by his splendid and beneficial achievements, and even after his death, such men as Sprat, Waller, and Dryden panegyricized in a style which surpassed all precedent in the English language, the virtues both of his public and private character.

Mr Hume, the most prejudiced and self-contradictory of all the writers who have described him, admits that it must be acknowledged, that the protector, in his civil and domestic administration, displayed as great regard, both to justice and clemency, as his usurped authority, derived from no law, and founded only on the sword, could possibly permit,—that all the chief offices in the courts of judicature were filled with men of integrity,—that, amidst the virulence of faction, the decrees of the judges were upright and impartial,—and that to every man but himself—and to himself, except when necessity required the contrary—the law was the great rule of his conduct and behaviour; and that, though often urged by his officers, to attempt a general massacre of the royalists, he always with horror rejected such sanguinary counsels. Bishop Burnet also says, when referring to the gentleness of his disposition—“this gentleness had, in a good measure, quieted people’s minds with relation to him; and his maintaining the honour of the nation in all foreign countries, gratified the vanity which is very natural to Englishmen; of which national honour he was so careful, that though he was not a crowned head, yet his ambassadors had all the respects paid them which our king’s ambassadors ever had. He said the dignity of the crown was upon account of the nation, of which the king was only the representative head; so the nation being still the same, he would have the same regards paid to his ministers.” He adds, that all Italy trembled at the name of Cromwell, and seemed under a panic-fear as long as he lived,—that his fleet scoured the Mediterranean, and the Turks durst not offend him, but delivered up Hide, who kept up the character of an ambassador from the king there, and was brought over and executed for it,—that the putting the brother of the king of Portugal’s ambassador to death for murder, was the carrying justice very far, since, though in the strictness of the law of nations, it is only the ambassador’s

own person that is exempted from any authority but his master's that sends him, yet that the practice had gone in favour of all that the ambassador owned to belong to him. Cromwell, continues the bishop, showed his good understanding in nothing more than in seeking out capable and worthy men for all employments, but most particularly for the courts of law, which gave a general satisfaction. The same historian also relates, that such was the dread the Dutch felt for him, that they took care to give him no sort of umbrage, and that, when at any time the king or his brothers came to see their sister the princess-royal, within a day or two after, they used to send a deputation to let them know that Cromwell had required of the States that they should give them no harbour; that King Charles when he was seeking for colour for the war with the Dutch in 1672, urged it for one reason, that they suffered some of his rebels to live in their provinces; Borel, then their ambassador, answered, that it was a maxim of long standing among them, not to inquire upon what account strangers came to live in their country, but to receive them all, unless they had been concerned in conspiracies against the persons of princes: that the king told him upon that law they had used both himself and his brother: Borel in great simplicity answered, *Ha! Sire, c'étoit une autre chose; Cromwell étoit un grand homme, et il se faisoit craindre et par terre et par mer.* This, says Burnet, was very rough: that the king's answer was, *Je me feray craindre aussi a mon jour*—but that he was scarce as good as his word. It will be expected after what has been here advanced upon Cromwell's public character that we should at least give an opinion upon the measure of bringing the king to death—since this is the blackest charge brought against him, and has been most successfully used by his adversaries to impart an air of sanguinary tyranny and of deep laid, malignant purpose against the life of his sovereign. How far he was implicated in the transaction it may not be so difficult to determine, as how far it was against his nature or agreeable to it—or how far it was an expedient for the difficult crisis of affairs, or had been a cherished purpose of past days, to be attained at all hazards.

We are firmly convinced that satisfactory evidence exists of his previous wish to save and restore the king; and that at any period prior to the king's escape to the Isle of Wight, Cromwell would have used his utmost efforts to restore the monarchy, subject to the concession of those reasonable demands of the nation without which its restoration would have been the greatest of evils. It is moreover manifest, that had the king dealt candidly and sincerely with the general, he would have been restored, or at least the attempt would have been made by the leaders of the army, and upon more favourable terms than would have been demanded by the parliament. In fact, at that junction the king might have gained the army; and the king and the army might have calmed the parliament, which had become violent, as well as pacified the nation which was rent by hostile factions. Ludlow, than whom no man could be better acquainted with the fact, or better qualified to judge of Cromwell's conduct in the affair, explicitly charges this treating with the king for his return, as a great crime, calling it a driving on a bargain for the people's liberty by Oliver alone.

There remains no room for reasonable doubt that Cromwell assisted Charles in his flight from Hampton court, and that the king arrived on

the coast of Hampshire through Cromwell's connivance, in the possession of full liberty to quit the kingdom; and that his choice of the Isle of Wight as the place of his retreat was wholly his own act. It is also highly probable that Cromwell was sent into Scotland at the critical juncture, in order that he might not impede the republican party who were set upon bringing the king to trial. Cromwell declared that he did not know of the exclusion of the members from the house, which took place preparatory to the trial. It is certain that this step was decided upon, and taken, before his arrival in London; and it is equally true that Ludlow takes to himself the whole merit, as he is pleased to deem it, of that unjustifiable transaction. We think it upon the whole clear that Cromwell had no share in the formation of this design, nor in its execution till it was inevitable—that he came very reluctantly into the determination which others had formed. His arguments with the Scottish commissioners—given by Bishop Burnet—certainly show that he had become convinced both of the necessity and of the justice of the determination. There is a sufficient reason to account for such an alteration in his opinion, arising out of his fears of the republican party, who were the chief instruments and authors of the measure, and who had already become jealous of Cromwell. It is, at least, highly probable, that he was not then in a position to resist the republicans, and that he wished to conciliate them, in order that the long-agitated vessel might be steered into a safe and quiet harbour. We do not intend hereby to extenuate his concurrence, but to explain how it seems to have arisen, and how it may be made reconcileable with his previous wishes and efforts for the king's restoration.

The measure itself did not want plausible and able defenders upon a great variety of principles. Rapin has collected and stated them with precision and force. It was a step characteristic of the bold spirit of the age—tempting perhaps in its policy to them who sought the settlement of the nation and deemed it more cheaply purchased by the death of one man than by the slaughter of thousands. But even the defenders of its policy must confess its illegality, and that it was the greatest act of illegality, because it was an outrage beyond the contemplation of law, and the greatest act of injustice, because it was against the person of the highest justiciary. But it may be contended on behalf of those concerned in this deed, that they believed it in their consciences and judgments to be both just and necessary, which, though no proof of the legality or justice of the proceedings, should moderate the severity of their condemnation. If they proceeded not upon law, they yet were supported by powerful reasons of analogy, and these were, and always are, unanswerable reasons for the silence of law upon such anomalous acts as were then brought under impeachment.

Considering the distractions and various opinions of those times and the straits to which the king's conduct had reduced the nation, it would have been but honourable in the restored monarch afterwards to have extended his act of oblivion to all concerned. But crowned heads are allowed to take reprisals which uncrowned heads are not in their turn allowed to seek.

“This measure has been considered by its defenders as an useful and awful lesson to sovereigns, of the danger of offending their subjects by illegal or violent treatment; but it may surely also be equally useful

as a caution to subjects, not by intemperate language to provoke or irritate their sovereigns in seeking redress of real or imaginary grievances: both carried beyond a certain point must produce irreconcilableness, terminating in intestine commotion and war,"—an evil which ought to be equally great in the view, and abhorrent from the feelings of both parties; as it must always be equally inimical to their mutual interests.

In drawing these brief memorials to a close, it is our duty to remind the reader of more extended histories, that the truth is rarely to be obtained by a perusal of works written to serve one side, or under the influence of those political partialities which almost all men powerfully feel. There is no period of English history which carries with it so many prejudices, and which still excites so much of party-feeling, as that we have been describing. It is only by an extended examination, and a supreme love of truth, that we can detect the misrepresentations of partizans, and distribute justly the meed of praise and of blame. The reader should be especially forewarned to examine carefully every statement made by popular writers after the Restoration. The current once turned, every one seemed anxious to surrender himself to it. Several of the most distinguished authors of that era are now proved to have been grossly misinformed. Several who had lavishly praised the protector, subsequently employed their pens to revile him. The most unfair means were adopted to suppress evidence, to corrupt or destroy the memorials of his fame, and to swell the overpowering outcry raised not only against the commonwealth, but against the pure religion and excellent morals it had promoted. The consequence, as all know, was a resistless flood of impiety and licentiousness, which desolated both church and state. Against few who ever wrote history have such glaring falsifications been substantiated as against the professed historian of the 'Rebellion.' His ability is unquestionable, but his authority is now of little value. We recommend those who are anxious to form a just estimate of the times, and of the man, to follow no single guide, exclusively, but to suspend their judgment until they shall have given the writers, on both sides, a careful perusal. Mr Hume's work is no where so defective, and so prejudicial to truth, as in the portion which relates to the commonwealth. His infidelity disqualified him for sympathizing with the great men of that age, and his love of monarchy unfitted him to judge of their measures and their principles. He who does not set the liberty and the improvement of mankind above all the pomp of courts and rights of kings, is incompetent to judge the motives or appreciate the struggles of free men.

There is a greatness and a lustre about most of the leading patriots and writers of this memorable age, which is brightening with time, and daily rising above the clouds of reproach and obscurity which have been drawn over them. An age which has contributed more to our national literature than any other,—the books of which are still in many departments the staple of our libraries, and the mint for the supply of our currency,—which furnished the first theologians, the first orators, the ablest lawyers, the greatest scholars, and which bred and brought up in their colleges and schools the greatest philosophers, mathematicians, and metaphysicians,—an age that has never been equalled for the originality, vigour, and genius of the great mass of its productions, and

still stands as the proudest day of England's learning and piety, is surely not an age to be described by the names of hypocrisy and cant, nor to be branded as the reign of fanaticism and delusion. That there was much hypocrisy is only alleging that a country having much traffic and a large currency will have many counterfeits; and that the profession of religion should have been debased, is only stating that the wheat has chaff, and that there is no fruit without much false blossom. But when it is recollected that in this age flourished our most distinguished scholars and divines, or that by it they were nurtured and taught, it will assuredly counteract all that may be alleged on the score of those errors and imperfections by which it was deformed. A judge well-qualified to pronounce an opinion, at least upon the literature of that age, has said, "It would be difficult to conceive a notion or a fancy in politics, ethics, theology, or even in physics and physiology, which had not been anticipated by the men of that age."⁴

It will perhaps gratify the reader to see some account of the distinguished men who graced the university of Oxford only, during the protectorate. Among the independents—who were, perhaps, the favourite party of the protector, though by no means the exclusive objects of his patronage—we may name the celebrated Dr John Owen, whose writings still class among the standard works of divinity. He was vice-chancellor during five years, and served the next important office for nine. Dr Thomas Goodwin was scarcely his inferior in learning and talents. Anthony Wood describes him as one of the atlases and patriarchs of independency. Thankful Owen was president of St John's, and was remarkable for his elegant and fluent command of the Latin tongue. Porter was fellow of Magdalene college, proctor of the university, and distinguished for his learning, integrity, and general excellency of character. Charnock, who was senior proctor, was a distinguished writer. His works are well-known, and popular in the present day. Samuel Lee, also a proctor, was the author of several learned and curious works. Ralph Button was a distinguished scholar, of whom Dr Prideaux, rector of Exeter college, said that all who were elected beside him were not worth *a button*. Jonathan Godard was an eminent physician and chemist. Theophilus Gale is described by Wood as a person of great reading, an exact philologist and philosopher, a learned and industrious person of which his 'Court of the Gentiles' alone furnishes indubitable evidence. Thomas Cole was principal of St Mary's hall, and tutor to Locke and several other celebrated individuals. Lewis du Moulin was Camden professor of history, and author of many works. John Howe is universally admitted to have been one of the ablest divines England ever produced—assuredly he had no equal in his own day. Henry Stubb was second keeper of the Bodleian, of whom Wood says he was the most noted person of his age, and adds, "while he was under graduate, it was usual with him to discourse in the public schools very fluently in the Greek tongue. But since the king's restoration we have had no such matter, *which shows that education and discipline were more severe then than after, when scholars were given more to liberty and frivolous studies.*"

Among the presbyterians are to be recounted Drs Wilkinson, Green-

⁴ Coleridge.

wood, and Staunton. Dr Conant was an excellent scholar, and drew from Prideaux the classical pun *Conanti nihil difficile*. Dr Robert Harris was a great Hebrew scholar, chronologist, and historian. John Harmar was Regius professor of Greek, and is described as a most eminent philologist.

Among the episcopalians we find Dr Wilkins celebrated for his philosophical knowledge. Dr Seth Ward, the most noted mathematician and astronomer of his age; Dr John Wallis, celebrated for his knowledge of geometry, Dr Pococke, the first oriental scholar of his age, perhaps of the world; Dr Zouch, a very distinguished civilian; Dr Laugbain, an excellent linguist and philosopher, the friend of Pococke and Usher; Doctor, afterwards, Bishop Barlowe, Owen's tutor; Dr Hood, made chancellor of the university in 1660; Dr Hugh, master of university college, and retained as king's professor of divinity till his death in 1654, though an episcopalian; and Dr Hyde, author of the learned work on the religion of the Persians, and professor of Arabic. He was also one of Walton's assistants in the Polyglott; Robert Hooke and Robert Boyle were also at the same time residents at the university.

Such were some of the celebrated men who flourished in Oxford alone, during the commonwealth. It may be doubted whether that university ever enjoyed a greater number of persons eminent in their respective professions, or more distinguished for character, talents, and learning. They afford indubitable evidence of the truth of Thurloe's account of Cromwell, 'that he sought out men for places, and not places for men,'—a remark by no means generally applicable to the kings of the earth. The mere enumeration of their names is sufficient to show the justness of the eulogium which the vice-chancellor pronounced on the worth and celebrity of his colleagues in 1653. After speaking of their piety and candour, he thus proceeds:—"I could not but give such a public testimony, as a regard to truth and duty required from me, to the very respectable and learned men, the heads of the colleges, who have merited so highly of the church, for their distinguished candour, great diligence, uncommon erudition, blameless politeness, many of whom are zealously studious of every kind of literature, and many who, by their conduct in the early period of their youth, give the most promising hopes of future merit: so that I could venture to affirm, that no impartial and unprejudiced judge will believe that our university hath either been surpassed, or is now surpassed by any society of men in the world, either in point of proper respect and esteem for piety, for manners orderly and worthy of the Christian vocation, and for a due regard to doctrine, arts, languages, and all sciences that can be ornamental to wise and good men appointed for the public good."

Nor will our opinions of the learning and celebrity of Oxford during this period be lowered, if we run over a few of the persons who there received a part, or the whole of their academical education. Some of them were afterwards distinguished as philosophers and statesmen; some of them rose to eminent stations in the church, while others adorned the humbler ranks of non-conformist profession. Among the first class were:—John Locke; William Penn, the celebrated Quaker and the enlightened founder and legislator of Pennsylvania; Dr South, who in early life enjoyed the friendship and patronage of Dr Owen; Sir T. Millington, M. D., who was afterwards Sedlyan professor of

Natural History; Dr Ralph Bathurst, president of Trinity; Joseph Williamson, afterwards Secretary of State; Sir Christopher Wren the celebrated architect; Dr Daniel Whitby, well known for his critical acumen; Anthony Wood, the Oxford antiquary; Mr Joseph Granville, a distinguished writer, a fellow of the Royal society, and one of its most strenuous defenders; Launcelot Addison the father to the celebrated Joseph Addison; Henry Oldenburgh, a Saxon, afterwards secretary to the Royal Society. Learning, says Burnett, was then high at Oxford; chiefly the study of the Oriental tongues, which was much raised by the Polyglott Bible then set forth. They read the fathers much there; and mathematics, and the new philosophy were in great esteem. Even Clarendon testifies to the flourishing state of Oxford at this period. "It yielded," he says, "a harvest of extraordinary, good, and sound knowledge in all parts of learning; and many, who were wickedly introduced, applied themselves to the study of learning and the practice of virtue. So that when it pleased God to bring king Charles II. back to his throne, he found that university abounding in excellent learning, and little inferior to what it was before its desolation. It was also during this period, and in Oxford, that the foundation of the Royal society was laid. Several of its most distinguished promoters belonged to that university, or received their education in it."

If such was the flourishing state of Oxford, it will be readily inferred that Cambridge was not far behind it, in all that could give grace and usefulness to a seat of learning. Indeed the kingdom at large, and the church in particular, never was richer in wise, excellent, and able men. Every department of knowledge received invaluable accessions, while poetry in the person of the immortal Milton rose to a height which it has never since attained. Surely, notwithstanding some defects—and the sun they tell us has spots—he bears the palm of epic poetry, even from the great masters of antiquity. Waller was a favourite with the protector, and he has the honour of having greatly refined the rhythm of English verse. Cowley, Denham, and several other poets grace this period of our literature. Hobbes was one of the most distinguished ethical and metaphysical writers of his age,—a man of extraordinary vigour and subtlety, though an enemy to religion, and an advocate for absolute and arbitrary rule. The age was remarkable for some interesting speculations upon theories of government, especially upon the republican form, among which Harrington's *Oceana* is an interesting specimen. Perhaps the most important and useful discovery, amidst many which that age produced in the cause of science, was that of the circulation of the blood by the celebrated Harvey. Among the most splendid ornaments of the Episcopal church, we ought to mention the names of Taylor, Lightfoot, Selden, Usher, and Cudworth.

POLITICAL SERIES.

James K.

BORN A. D. 1566.—DIED A. D. 1625.

THE death of Elizabeth opened up the way for the accession of a new dynasty to the throne of England, in the person of James, the sixth Scottish monarch of that name, the son of Mary, queen of Scots, by Henry Lord Darnley, and great-grandson of Margaret, daughter of Henry VII. James left his Scottish capital on the 5th of April, 1603, to take possession of the richer diadem which, without effort or merit on his part, now awaited his acceptance. He entered London on the 7th of May, and was received with the most gratifying testimonies of respect and attachment; and in the following July, he and his queen were crowned with much solemnity by the archbishop of Canterbury. James was a weak man, and little fitted for the task of empire, more especially in such times as beheld the sceptres of two monarchies committed to his hands. He was fortunate, however, in his English ministry, which was composed of men little inferior to those through whom the maiden-queen had wielded her state so gallantly. Cecil, Bacon, Leicester, Drake, Walsingham, Sussex and Sidney, were no more. But Buckhurst, Cecil, Raleigh, Coke, and Egerton, still surrounded the throne and gave lustre to the court.

The flattering auspices under which James ascended the throne of England were soon exchanged for others ominous of evil. There were many peculiarities of personal character about James, which tended to disgust his new subjects. In the son of the beautiful Mary and graceful Darnley, they certainly could anticipate nothing forbidding either in manners or person; their disappointment therefore may be imagined, when a figure answering to the following description stood before them, invested with the title and authority of their liege lord and sovereign. "He was of a middle stature, more corpulent through his clothes than in his body, yet fat enough; his clothes ever being made large and easy, the doublets quilted for stiletto proof; his breeches in plaits and full stuffed. (He was naturally of a timorous disposition, which was the reason of his quilted doublets). His eye large, ever rolling after any stranger who came in his presence; insomuch as many for shame have left the room, as being out of countenance. His beard was very thin; his tongue too large for his mouth, and made his drinking very unseemly, as if eating his drink, which came out into the cup on each side his mouth. His skin was as soft as taffeta-sarsnet, which felt so, because he never washed his hands, only rubbed his finger ends slightly with the wet end of a napkin. His legs were very weak, having, as some thought, some foul play in his youth, or rather before he was born, that he was not able to stand at seven years of age; that weakness made him ever leaning on other men's shoulders; his walk was ever circular." Nor could any thing be more offensive to English feelings in that age, than the partiality which James took every opportunity of showing towards Scotsmen. One of his very first acts after his arrival in London, was to inscribe the names of six Scotsmen on the list of the

privy council; in a short time every office that the king had it in his power to bestow, was filled by Scotsmen, who, encouraged by the success of the first adventurers, flocked in crowds to the English court, and beset the king and his ministry with their importunate demands for honours, places, and pensions, under the new regime. The English looked with jealous eyes on these intruders, "by whom nothing was unasked, and to whom nothing was denied."¹ But James persevered in his course of favouritism so long as he possessed the means of gratifying one greedy Scot.

His severity of temper in respect to religious dissentients disgusted a large and powerful body of his subjects. Both presbyterians and puritans suffered at his hands the most unworthy treatment, while the episcopalian party had their fears reasonably alarmed by the language which the king sometimes held in reference to the faith of Rome. We have pretty good evidence that James, notwithstanding the many compliments which were paid him on the score of the soundness of his divinity, had a strong leaning towards popery. In his first speech to parliament he made some strange acknowledgments for a protestant: declaring that the church of Rome, though defiled by many corruptions, was, notwithstanding, the mother-church of the faithful, and that he would most willingly indulge the Romish clergy provided they would only renounce the pope's supremacy and his dispensing powers. He even talked of "meeting them in the midway, so that all novelties might be renounced on either side." We know that he heartily disliked the presbyterian form of church government as too republican for his ideas of kingly authority; and upon the same principle he bitterly hated the English puritans, whom he stigmatized as "novelists,"—persons ever discontented with the present government in church, and impatient to suffer any superiority, which," he added, "maketh their seats insufferable in any well-governed commonwealth."

James's notions of civil government also were little calculated to win the affections of his subjects. He claimed for himself powers such as even Henry VIII. had never ventured to arrogate. He told his English parliament, that, "the power of kings was like the Divine power; for, as God can create and destroy, make and unmake at his pleasure, so kings can give life and death, judge all, and be judged by none! As it was blasphemy," he added "to dispute what God might do, so it was sedition in subjects to dispute what a king might do in the height of his power!" Mr Brodie has described James's conduct as perfectly consistent with these ideas: "In ecclesiastical matters he assumed supreme power, and struck at the very vitals of the constitution by issuing illegal proclamations with penalties which were enforced by the star-chamber, while, by levying taxes without an act of parliament, he prepared the way for the disuse of that assembly. He, of his own accord, imposed new duties on the ports, and arrogated the right of doing so at pleasure,—a pretension in which he was supported by venal statesmen and corrupt lawyers, who concurred in fabricating precedents to deceive the people; nay, his judges solemnly decided so monstrous a principle in his favour. Innumerable projects and monopolies were devised for raising money, but he was latterly obliged to pass an act against them; forced loans, without the pressing emergencies which were used as an apology for

¹ Osborn.

them in the preceding reign, were resorted to, and the hateful measure of benevolence, which had been so much reprobated, and so opposed even in Henry VIII., and so long discontinued, was revived.”²

One of James’s first duties as sovereign of England was to give audience to the different embassies of congratulation which presented themselves at his court. Among these was one from Henry IV. of France, who anxiously desired the support of an alliance with England against the power of Austria. With this view he sent his confidant and prime minister the marquis de Rosni, afterwards duke de Sully, on the first mission to the new sovereign of England. It is interesting to know what was the state of parties at the English court, as they appeared to so acute an observer as Rosni. He informs us that the Scottish party, headed by the duke of Lennox, the earl of Mar, and Lords Erskine, and Kinloss were attached to French interest; that the nouse of Howard supported the Spanish faction; that the lords Buckhurst and Cecil seemed neither to espouse the interests of France nor those of Spain, but aimed at the restoration of the ancient house of Burgundy; and that the earls of Northumberland, Southampton, and Cumberland, with Cobham, Raleigh, and Markham, seemed to be of no party, nor to have any fixed agreement amongst themselves, but to be agreed only in the love of novelty and a desire for change.

The proceedings adopted in consequence of the Raleigh plot, as it was called, placed James in an unfavourable light in the estimation of the public; but the details of this affair will be given in our memoir of Raleigh himself. We next find James gratifying his taste for polemical divinity by the celebrated Hampton-court conference betwixt four puritan divines and as many bishops of the English church, the king himself acting as moderator. We shall quote Sir John Harrington’s account of the king’s behaviour on this notable occasion.—“The bishops,” says he, “came to the king about the petition of the puritans—I was by and heard much discourse. The king talked much Latin, and disputed with Dr Reynolds at Hampton; but he rather used upbraidings than argument, and told the petitioners that they wanted to strip Christ again, and bid them away with their snivelling. The bishops seemed much pleased, and said his majesty spoke by the power of inspiration. I wist not what they mean, but the spirit was rather foul mouthed.” When the puritan champions ventured to petition for the renewal of those meetings for religious purposes among the clergy called prophesyings, James broke out into such coarse invectives as the following:—“If you aim at a Scottish presbytery, it agrees as well with monarchy as God and the devil; then Jack and Tom, and Will and Dick shall meet, and at their pleasure censure me and my counsel. Therefore, I reiterate my former speech,—*Le roi s’avisera*.—Stay, I pray, for one seven years before you demand, and then, if you find me grow pursy and fat, I may perchance hearken unto you; for that government will keep me in breath and give me work enough.” The royal moderator concluded his harangue by informing the puritan disputants that he would “make them conform themselves, or else harrie them out of the land, or else do worse.”³ The puritan party were thus early made to know that they had nothing to hope for from the new sovereign.

² Hist. of the Brit. Emp. vol. i. pp. 351, 352.

³ Fuller’s Church Hist., Book x. p. 18.

James had been seated nearly a twelvemonth on the throne of England before he convoked his first parliament; and when he at last so far complied with the spirit of the constitution, he took it upon him to instruct the electors what kind of persons they should choose for their representatives, and even to threaten them with forfeiture of their franchise if they disregarded his injunctions in this matter. Where such imprudence presided at the outset, little wisdom could be expected to mark the progress of the king's intercourse with his parliament. Accordingly we find him stumbling upon two of the most alarming subjects which he could have ventured to touch upon in his opening speech to the parliament, namely, his plan for a union of the two kingdoms, and his wish to meet the Roman Catholics half-way as he expressed it. With his usual imprudence, James chose the very moment when his commons had confirmed Sir Francis Goodwin's election in opposition to the royal wish, to press upon them his favourite project for a union of the two kingdoms. It was of course instantly crushed by the undisguised manifestations of antipathy with which the project was met on all sides. James beheld the defeat of his darling scheme with much chagrin, and gave vent to his feelings in an angry and inconsiderate letter to his commons.

On the 5th of November 1605, the discovery of the gunpowder-plot filled the country with horror and dismay. The details of this memorable conspiracy will be found in our notice of the principal conspirator, Catesby. James's conduct on this occasion was exceedingly characteristic. He made a speech to parliament in which he extolled his own dexterity in interpreting some dark phrases in Lord Monteagle's letter, "contrary to the ordinary grammar construction of them, and to another sort than any divine or lawyer in any university would have taken them." He then cautioned them against too hastily inculcating Roman Catholics, and avowed his belief that no foreign prince had been concerned in hatching so vile a plot. But after thus instructing the two houses in what manner he desired the affair to be viewed and treated, to the astonishment and indignation of all he prorogued the parliament: thus keeping the nation in a state of feverish excitement for some months.

In July 1607, James again announced a prorogation of parliament, which was afterwards extended till February 1610. In the meantime he engaged in a series of negotiations with the Spanish court, with the view to an alliance between his son Charles and a younger infanta, while, with his usual inconsistency, he rushed into the controversy on the oath of allegiance with a zeal which afresh exasperated all the Catholic leaders throughout Europe. The oath of allegiance was one of the first defensive measures adopted by the English parliament in the first impulse of horror and fear after the discovery of the gunpowder-plot. It was a simple declaration of civil obedience to the king, with an absolute renunciation of the deposing power of the pope. Some of the English Catholics took it at once and without hesitation, but others demurred, Cardinal Bellarmine expressed his opinion against it, and Father Preston, and James himself, defended it. Of the doctors of the Sorbonne, forty-eight approved the test and only six condemned it. The treatise which James wrote on this occasion is unquestionably the best of his pieces. It was at first published anonymously; but, in 1609, he republished it with his name, and a præmonition in reply to Bellarmine.

The king's pecuniary necessities at last compelled him to meet parliament in February 1610. His opening speech was on this occasion still more offensive than any which he had yet delivered. He asserted that kings were before laws, and that all laws were granted by them as matter of favour only to the people. He declared that he would not allow his power to be disputed upon; and ended by demanding a pecuniary supply. The commons voted a supply considerably inferior to the royal demand, and in the month of July, parliament was prorogued to the ensuing October. On reassembling, the commons continued as intractable as ever in money-matters, and would vote no supplies without an equivalent in privileges. It was in vain that James alternately flattered and threatened them; they continued inflexible, and James at last dissolved in anger this his first parliament, and had recourse to the meanest shifts to supply his pecuniary necessities. He revived an obsolete law, which compelled all persons possessed of £40 a year in land to compound for not receiving the order of knighthood; he created a new title, that of baronet, and exposed it for sale to any one who could give £1,000 for it. Even the peerage itself was offered to sale: the title of earl might be had for £20,000; of viscount for £10,000; and of baron for £5000.

The death of the king's promising son, Prince Henry, in 1612, diffused universal gloom over the nation, which was however somewhat lightened by the nuptials of James's only surviving daughter, the following year, to the elector-palatine. In 1614, the king had recourse to a benevolence which gained him only £50,000.

It had always been a favourite project of James's to bring the church of Scotland, in point of government and ceremonies, as near as possible to the model of the English church. Episcopacy had been already established in Scotland, but it was not yet what the king wished it to be; the ceremonies of the Anglican church were wanting; a high-commission court was likewise wanting to complete James's ideas of what a well-ordered ecclesiastical polity should be. Early in the summer of 1617, he undertook a journey to his native kingdom for this purpose, but concealing his real motives under an affectation of attachment to his dear Scotland, or, to use the elegant language of his own proclamation, "a salmon-lyke instinct, a great and natural longing to see our native soyle and place of our birth and breeding." The earl of Buckingham, and a party of favourite courtiers, with three bishops, composed his train on this occasion. The royal progress was very magnificent and stately. James wished to impress his old subjects with profound ideas of his new grandeur as sovereign of England, and for that purpose spent a much greater sum than his impoverished finances could well afford in the equipment and accompaniments of his cortege. The Scots on their part prepared to receive his majesty with all honours, and especially with those scenes of pedantic trifling and fulsome adulation for which he had such a liking. One orator told him that his departure from Scotland, though to take possession of a crown, had overwhelmed his faithful Scottish subjects with affliction, "deepe sorrowe and fear possessing their herts, their places of solace only giving a new heate to the fever of the languishing remembrance of their former happiness; the verie hilles and groves, accustomed of before to be refreshed with the dewe of his majesty's presence, had ceased to put on their wonted ap-

parell, and with pale looks represented their miserie for the departure of their royal king." The universities of Edinburgh and St Andrews held solemn disputations before his majesty, who testified his satisfaction of the entertainment by punning on the names of the exhibitors. After spending several weeks in this way, James retired to Falkland to enjoy the pleasures of the chace amid the scenes of his youth, while his ministers employed themselves in concocting the measures by which conformity might be secured in Scotland. The Scottish parliament met on the 17th of June, and an act was proposed as the basis of all further proceedings, declaring, "that in ecclesiastical affairs, whatever should be determined by the king, with the advice of the prelates, and a competent number of the clergy, should receive the operation and force of law." The clergy instantly protested against a measure which would have virtually annihilated their church, and James was constrained to yield to their remonstrance, but he avenged himself by establishing a court of high-commission, which instantly passed sentence of deprivation against several of the protesters. He, however, consented to submit his propositions to a general assembly of the Scottish church, which accordingly met soon after his return to England. The concessions which the assembled clergy agreed to make proved unsatisfactory, and roused James to a high pitch of resentment, in the dread of which a second general assembly, held at Perth in August, 1618, sanctioned the five following articles: namely, that the eucharist should be received kneeling; that it should be administered in private to the sick; that baptism should be privately administered in cases of necessity; that episcopal confirmation should be given to youth; and that the great festivals of the church should be duly celebrated. Sir Walter Scott has been pleased to say, that these articles had at least decency to recommend them, and to express his surprise at the "headlong opposition" with which they were met by the presbyterians—for there was hardly a parish in Scotland which really observed them; and a very recent biographer of James thinks that Scotsmen of the present age must wonder at the abhorrence with which their ancestors regarded "these innocent and perhaps laudable innovations." Both the historian and the biographer evidently lose sight of the real merits of the case when they talk thus. If the observances in question were really so trifling in their nature, the pertinacity of the king in thrusting them upon a portion of his subjects, at the risk of driving them from their allegiance, was surely much more ridiculous and blame-worthy than the obstinacy of the presbyterians in rejecting them. But the people of Scotland did not regard the proposed measures as of trifling import; they beheld in them an approximation to a religion which they regarded as idolatrous, and, whether they were right or not in the opinion, they conscientiously held it, and acted just as men should act in such circumstances; they rejected the right of man to interfere between God and their consciences.

The death of Raleigh, and the condemnation of the lord-treasurer for corruption, and the death of the queen, were the principal incidents of the year 1618. Probably James himself would have added to this dry chronology of great events the important one of the publication, in this year, of a complete collection of his own prose works, both in the original and in a Latin translation. This publication was edited by James

Montague, brother to the lord-treasurer. In 1611 James had displayed his zeal for orthodoxy by haughtily remonstrating with the Dutch States for permitting the Arminian, Vorstius, to hold a professorship in one of their universities. The same motives of state policy which induced the States to compliment the king of England by removing Vorstius from his chair, led them to invite James to send delegates to the famous synod of Dort, which met in November 1618. We shall have occasion to notice this celebrated meeting more fully in our sketches of Hall and Davenant, two of James's deputies. We may only remark here that James carried more than his usual prudence in the selection of his delegates, and the instructions which he tendered to them on this occasion.

The close of the life of James was signalized by violent contests with his parliament, which prepared dreadful consequences for his successor. He was also much disquieted by the misfortunes of his son-in-law, the elector-palatine, who had been stripped of all his dominions by the emperor. Urged by natural feelings for the protestant cause, James was at length, in 1624, induced to declare war against Spain and the emperor. It was not, however, without great reluctance that he consented to this step, nor would any considerations of national honour or interest have persuaded him to it, had not his son Charles and his favourite Buckingham, for once in the pursuit of their own private ends, supported the popular cause. The military expedition, however, to Holland proved a miserable failure. Spinola's generalship overmatched that of Maurice; the French court stood aloof from the struggle, and the Dutch received their English allies with coldness and inhumanity. Chagrined at the turn which affairs had taken towards his favourite ally, Spain,—distracted by the cabals of his courtiers,—and irritated by what appeared to him the arrogance of his parliament and the disloyalty of his people,—James's health, already shaken by the intemperate use of strong and sweet wines and repeated attacks of gout, began to give way; and early in the spring of 1625, he was seized with tertian ague, which carried him off on the 27th of March in the same year, but not without suspicions of foul play from Buckingham.

This monarch has found an able biographer in Miss Lucy Aikin,⁴ and an amusing one, at least, in Mr Robert Chambers.⁵ We shall avail ourselves of Miss Aikin's pen in summing up the general character of James. "It is agreed by all writers," says this instructive authoress, "that a monarch has seldom quitted the world less deplored by his subjects than James I.; his detractors ascribe this insensibility to his demerits, his panegyrists to the ingratitude of human nature; more impartial estimators may be inclined to compromise the difference, by saying that the intentions of this prince were better than his performance; and that the people, who suffered by his errors of judgment, were little inclined to accept, in so important a concern as the good government of the country, the will for the deed.

"The praise of wisdom so profusely lavished upon this sovereign during his lifetime, appears to those who study only the public history of his reign, peculiarly and eminently inapplicable. In England, he

⁴ *Memoirs of the Court of King James the First.* London, 1832. 2 vol. 8vo. 2d ed.

⁵ *Life of King James the First in Constable's Miscellany.* Edin. 1830.

never succeeded in a single favourite object of his policy ; and both his objects themselves and his modes of pursuing them were so repugnant to the feelings and judgments of his subjects, that he lost in the vain pursuit of them that for which no success could have indemnified him,—the general esteem and attachment. Yet to speculative wisdom the monarch might advance some plausible pretensions : it is true that in his writings and speeches there is much bad logic, and that he sometimes avails himself of arguments which might with more effect be turned against him ; they are also blemished by many levities, indiscretions and even indecorums of expression, and by the quaintness and pedantry which were the vices of the age ; but they still exhibit marks of acuteness, of reflection, and of a kind of talent. No one was more skilful in starting objections and foreseeing dangers and difficulties ; and the event gave, in some instances, a character of prophetic truth to his warnings which must have been the result of genuine sagacity. In the arguments which he loved to hold with the scholars and divines who attended him at his meals, he often excited unaffected admiration ; for his learning on the favourite topics of the time was considerable, his memory ready, his expression fluent ; his replies were often happy, and his doubts and questions pertinent and well urged.

“The apophthegms of King James, collected and published either during his life or soon after his death, are for the most part only of a moderate degree of merit ; but some of his *bon-mots* are entitled to higher praise : the most favourable specimen of them is perhaps his exhortation to some insignificant person on whom he was conferring the honour of knighthood, while his sheepish looks proclaimed his own sense of his unworthiness to sustain this dignity :—‘Hold up thy head, man, I have more cause to be ashamed than thou !’

“In his youth, the monarch paid homage to the muses ; he ventured to indite a love-sonnet to Queen Elizabeth,—of which however she did not deign even to acknowledge the receipt,—and he published at Edinburgh a poem called the *Furies*, translated from Du Bartas,—a French writer of temporary celebrity ;—a heroic poem on the battle of Lepanto, and several other pieces. The style of the royal poet strongly resembles that of the noted Sternhold, nor was his imagination more brilliant than his diction.

“One of the offices which James was most fond of assuming, was that of an examiner of delinquents ; and in this capacity, where his real skill and ingenuity were aided by the awe which royalty inspires, and by his contempt for the maxim of English law which protects suspected criminals from answering questions dangerous to themselves, his success was sometimes remarkable. In the affair of Overbury, he contrived to extract from Sir Gervase Elways confessions which cost him his life ; he drove the sleeping preacher to a full avowal of his ridiculous imposture, and by his unwearied exertions detected several pretended demoniacs, and brought them to ask pardon on their knees. These counterfeits, whose appearance was frequent during the reign of James, were usually the puppets either of a catholic priest or a puritan minister, who sought by this means one of two ends,—to cast upon his opponents the imputation of having bewitched innocent persons,—or to acquire for himself the reputation of successful exorcism ; a gift which all parties believed to be distinctive of professors of the true religion.

That such impositions were in fact connected with the designs of religious parties, is the only circumstance capable of palliating the ridicule attached to a king of England gravely occupying himself, and sometimes his privy-council, in watching the contortions, and making minutes of the ravings, of a set of miserable wretches, either pure impostors or the real subjects of epilepsy, who might with so much less ceremony have been consigned to the remedial methods of an hospital or a bridewell.

“One advantage however accrued to the sovereign himself from these investigations; they disclosed to him such examples of knavery, delusion and imposture in these matters, that he is said to have heartily repented the support which he had lent to popular superstition by the publication of his ‘*Demonologia*,’ and, in his latter years, to have nearly renounced his faith in witchcraft.

“Vanity was a leading foible in the character of James, and one source of some of the principal mistakes of his reign. It was an overweening of his own eloquence and polemical skill which tempted him to hold the conference at Hampton court, where, under the notion of confuting the refractory puritans, he insulted them by menaces and revilings, and thus converted this formidable party from mere dissatisfied sectaries, into determined political enemies. The same principle, exalting his idea of the surpassing majesty of the kingly character, prompted him to indulge in those arrogant and even blasphemous representations of his own prerogative and dignity which filled all true Englishmen with indignation and disgust, and implanted in the bosoms of his parliaments jealousies which he found it impossible to eradicate. It was in a great measure also his vanity which prompted him to seek, on behalf of his heir, those alliances with the great catholic sovereigns which became the source of so much offence to his people, and finally of irreparable ruin to his posterity.

“On his propensity to favouritism it is needless to expatiate; every page in his history is an exemplification of his weakness, and of the endless mischiefs which it is calculated to produce. The only excuse for his blind indulgence to the objects of his affection, must be derived from his boundless good-nature; which overflowed upon all who approached him, and rendered it a moral impossibility for him to refuse any request urged with importunity. His profuse liberality, which sprung from the same source, was the chief if not the sole cause of his constant want of money; for his personal habits were simple and uniform in a remarkable degree; he cared for few objects of magnificence, and indulged in no expensive pleasures, unless the sports of the field deserve to be accounted such when pursued by a monarch. Of these sports, in which James consumed so large a portion of his time, it was the worst effect, that they contributed to foster that irascibility on small provocations which so frequently transported him beyond the bounds of dignity and even of common decency, and on some occasions exposed him to the contempt, of the meanest of his people. An anecdote to this effect, related by Sir Thomas Wentworth, afterwards earl of Strafford, belongs to the last year of James’s life, and may here find a place.

“‘I will . . . write you news from the court at Rufford, where the loss of a stag, and the hounds hunting foxes instead of deer, put the

king your master into a marvellous chafe, accompanied with those ordinary symptoms better known to you courtiers, I conceive, than to us country swains; in the height whereof comes a clown galloping in, and staring full in his face; 'Sblood,' quoth he, 'am I come forty miles to see a fellow?' and presently in a great rage turns about his horse, and away he goes faster than he came. The oddness whereof caused his majesty and all the company to burst out into a vehement laughter; and so the fume, for the time, was happily dispersed."⁶

"Another story, for which we are indebted to Wilson, is equally illustrative of the faults and excellencies of the monarch's disposition. In the midst of the negotiations for the Spanish match, the king, who was at Theobalds, was much discomposed by missing some important papers which he had received respecting it. On recollection, he was persuaded that he had intrusted them to his old servant Gib, a Scotchman and gentleman of the bedchamber. Gib, on being called, declared, humbly but firmly, that no such papers had ever been given to his care; on which the king, transported with rage, after much reviling, kicked him as he kneeled before him. 'Sir,' exclaimed Gib, instantly rising, 'I have served you from my youth, and you never found me unfaithful; I have not deserved this from you, nor can I live longer with you under this disgrace: fare ye well, sir, I will never see your face more:' and he instantly took horse for London. No sooner was the circumstance known in the palace, than the papers were brought to the king by Endymion Porter, to whom he had given them. He asked for Gib, and being told that he was gone, ordered them to post after him and bring him back; vowing that he would neither eat, drink, nor sleep till he saw him. And when he at length beheld him entering his chamber, he kneeled down and very earnestly begged his pardon; nor would he rise from this humble posture till he had in a manner compelled the confused and astonished Gib to pronounce the words of absolution."⁷

Robert Catesby.

BORN CIR. A. D. 1558.—DIED A. D. 1605.

ROBERT CATESBY, one of the principal conspirators in the gunpowder treason, was a descendant of Catesby, the favourite minion of Richard III., and enjoyed the family estate of Ashby St Legers, in Northamptonshire. His early education was probably intrusted to some catholic priest, or jesuit, who imbued the youth's mind with those wretched notions of the supreme claims of the church of Rome on all its members, to which he afterwards sacrificed his property and life. As early as the year 1588, his attachment to the catholic interest was known to be so strong, that he was one of those whom it was judged expedient, on the approach of the armada, to commit to Wisbeach castle.

Some years afterwards, he engaged in Garnet's traitorous negotiations with the court of Spain. Garnet seems to have relied a good

⁶ Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches, vol. i. p. 23.

⁷ History of Great Britain, p. 219.

deal on Catesby's assistance and counsels in the desperate game which he was playing; but the peace with Spain cut off many of the projects of the Roman faction, and threw Catesby idle for a time. James I., it is well known, seemed at first very favourably disposed towards the catholic party, but as soon as that monarch changed his line of policy, and began to threaten the catholics with a revival of Elizabeth's penal laws, Catesby, and some other desperate spirits, conceived the design of the gunpowder-plot, and carried their designs into action with a precipitancy which ultimately defeated their own object. Catesby, who was the originator of the whole plot, first communicated his design to Francis Tresham, a catholic gentleman, who seems to have suffered imprisonment with Catesby in Wisbeach castle, under the same suspicions. Tresham entered readily into the plot, having already written a work in which he maintained the right and duty of all true sons of the church to depose a heretic sovereign. The two conspirators then took into their association one Thomas Percy, who conceived himself to have received a deep personal injury from James. Five or six others, chiefly gentlemen of family in the midland counties, were added to the confederacy, and the whole conspirators, after swearing secrecy and fidelity to each other, received the sacrament and absolution from Desmond, alias Greenway, a jesuit. On some hesitation manifesting itself among the band, Catesby put the following case of conscience to Father Garnet:—"Whether, for the good and promotion of the catholic cause against heretics, the necessity of the time and occasion so requiring, it were lawful or not, amongst many guilty, to destroy also some innocent." The jesuit responded affirmatively, and it was now decided, without a dissentient voice, to blow up the whole parliament when assembled together in one house on the 5th of November.

There was one Faukes, born of a good family in Yorkshire, but who had followed the profession of arms from his youth, and acquired a daring and desperate character during a life of much vicissitude. This man had already been of service to the jesuits, in conducting some of their negotiations betwixt England and the continent, and was now pitched upon by the conspirators as a fit hand to prepare the mine and fire the train by which they hoped to annihilate the protestant cause in England at once and for ever. Faukes was now in Flanders, but was speedily procured, and, assuming the character of Percy's servant, proceeded to arrange a number of barrels, filled with gunpowder, in the vaults beneath the parliament-house, which Percy had been allowed to rent. It was resolved that, as soon as the blow was struck, one party of the conspirators should hasten to Warwickshire, and having secured the person of the princess Elizabeth, proclaim her queen. Sir William Stanley, a renegade English officer, who had entered the service of the archduke of Spain, was to land a force in England at the same time.

At first the conspirators hired a house adjoining to that in which the house of lords met, and proceeded to run a mine under the latter from the interior of the former. But an opportunity which offered for hiring the vaults beneath the house of lords, induced them to abandon their mine after having laboured at it for several months with great diligence. Successive prorogations of parliament long suspended the hopes of the conspirators, and kept them exposed to fearful peril, from the betrayal

or desertion of any of their number ; but they preserved their fidelity towards each other, and seem to have pursued their infernal purpose with a steadiness and resolution worthy of a better cause. At last the fatal day approached on which it was resolved parliament should meet. The king in person was to open the session, the queen and court were to be present as spectators, and both houses were to assemble under the same roof. The eve of the decisive day beheld every thing in readiness on the part of the conspirators,—the barrels of powder were arranged,—the train was laid,—and even the desperate Faukes had taken his place in the cellarage, with a tinder-box and dark lantern, ready to fire the match when the fatal hour should arrive, when “a circumstance, beyond calculation, or beyond control,—the intense anxiety of a woman’s heart for the safety of a beloved object,” revealed the desperate purposes of the conspirators, in time to save the objects of their horrid plot. On the 3d of November, Lord Monteagle received an anonymous letter, warning him, in mysterious terms, against being present at the opening of parliament on the 5th. This communication is supposed to have been prompted by the affection of his lordship’s sister, the wife of Thomas Habington, one of the conspirators. It instantly excited alarm at court, and the lord-chamberlain was directed to make a strict examination of all places contiguous to the house of lords next day. At midnight, on the 5th of November, a magistrate entered the vaults, under the pretext of searching for stolen goods, and detected the barrels of powder, with the arch-incendiary, Faukes himself, who was immediately taken into custody.

The conspirators, on hearing of the discovery having been made, hastened into Warwickshire, with the intention of seizing the person of the princess Elizabeth, and raising the standard of revolt ; but the vigilance of Sir John Harrington secured the princess, and the sheriff having raised the country, the rebels, whose total number did not exceed eighty, threw themselves into Holbeach house, on the borders of Staffordshire, the family seat of Stephen Lyttleton, one of the conspirators. For a time they defended themselves desperately here, but an accidental explosion of some of their powder scorched several of them and compelled the rest to endeavour to fight their way through their assailants. In this attempt, Catesby, Percy, and three others, were slain ; Lyttleton and Winter escaped ; the rest, amongst whom were Sir Everard Digby, surrendered, and were carried to London.

Sir Everard Digby.

BORN A. D. 1581.—DIED A. D. 1606.

THIS catholic gentleman, memorable for the share he had in the gunpowder-plot, was born in the year 1581, of a very ancient and honourable family. His father, Everard Digby, of Drystoke, in Rutlandshire, was a man of considerable learning and genius, and the author of several treatises on scientific and other subjects. His early death left his son, Everard, at the tender age of eleven, to the uncontrolled direction of certain catholic priests, who instilled into his tender mind the idea of implicit obedience to his mother-church, as the first and

most sacred of human obligations. On attaining manhood, Digby was one of the most accomplished and fascinating men of his age. Elizabeth, with all her abhorrence of heresy, was compelled to admire the handsome papist, and bestowed several marks of royal favour upon him. Her successor, James, knighted him.

By his marriage with Mary, daughter and sole heiress of William Mulsho of Gothurst, in Bucks, he obtained a large accession to his fortune. But his intimacy with Tresham involved him in that fatal plot, which was destined to bring a life, otherwise fair and prosperous, to an ignominious close. The arguments by which Sir Everard was persuaded to engage in this affair, according to his own account, were these :—First, he was told that King James had broken his promises, solemnly made to the catholics ; secondly, he was assured that the council contemplated introducing a number of very severe laws against popery, in the next parliament ; thirdly—and this was the reason, he confessed, which weighed most with him—he felt it to be the duty of every member of the catholic church to aim at its restoration, even at the hazard of life and fortune. By such reasoning as this, Sir Everard was prevailed upon to join Catesby and Tresham in their dark conspiracy ; and with such ardour did he engage in the design, that he offered £1,500 from his own purse, towards defraying the expenses of it, and received Guy Faukes into his own house during the suspension of their proceedings, occasioned by the unexpected prorogation of parliament.

Upon his commitment to the tower, with the other conspirators taken at Holbeach house, he solemnly declared his ignorance of the intended plot, and during all his examinations, carefully avoided inculcating any other persons than those already dead, or who had been taken, like himself, in open rebellion. In giving utterance, as a dying man, to such notorious falsehoods as those by which he attempted to conceal from the government the nature and extent of the disconcerted plot, Sir Everard was doubtless supported by the exceedingly perverted notions of moral duty which had been instilled into his mind by his jesuitical tutors. Yet, it was not without a deep inward conflict that he maintained the part he did before his examiners. In some notes which he contrived to send to his lady during his imprisonment, he has such passages as the following :—“ Now, for my intentions, let me tell you, that if I had thought there had been the least sin in the plot, I would not have been of it for the world ; and no other cause drew me to hazard my fortune and life, but zeal to God’s religion. For my keeping it secret, it was caused by certain belief that those who were best able to judge of the lawfulness of it, had been acquainted with it and given way to it. More reasons I had to persuade me to this belief than I dare utter, which I will never to the suspicion of any, though I should to the rack for it ; and as I did not know it directly that it was approved by such, so did I hold it in my conscience the best not to know any more if I might. I have, before all the lords, cleared all the priests in it, for any thing that I know ; but now, let me tell you what a grief it hath been to me, to hear that so much condemned, which I did believe would be otherwise thought on by catholics ; there is no other cause but that which hath made me desire life, for when I came into prison death would have been a welcome friend unto me, and was most desired ; but when I heard how catholics and priests thought of the matter, and that

it should be a great sin that should be the cause of my end, it called my conscience in doubt of my very best actions and intentions in question, for I knew that myself might easily be deceived in such a business; therefore, I protest unto you, that the doubts I had of my own good state—which only proceeded from the censure of others—caused more bitterness of grief in me than all the miseries that ever I suffered, and only this caused me to wish life till I might meet with a ghostly friend. For some good space I could do nothing, but, with tears, ask pardon at God's hands, for all my errors, both in actions and intentions, in this business, and in my whole life, which the censure of this, contrary to my expectance, caused me to doubt." In a subsequent letter, he states more explicitly his grounds of belief, received from Garnet, that the pope approved of the enterprize generally, though without knowing the particulars.

Nor was he singular in these sentiments. Most of the other conspirators gloried in the transaction in which they had been engaged, and spent their last breath in expressing their regret that their design should have been frustrated in the manner it was. On this point, Hume's observations are worthy of notice:—"Neither," says he, "had the desperate fortune of the conspirators urged them to this enterprize, nor had the former profligacy of their lives prepared them for so great a crime. Before that audacious attempt, their conduct seems, in general, liable to no reproach. Catesby's character had entitled him to such regard that Rookwood and Digby were seduced by their implicit trust in his judgment; and they declared that from the motive alone of friendship to him, they were ready, on any occasion, to have sacrificed their lives. Digby himself was as highly esteemed and beloved as any man in England; and he had been particularly honoured with the good opinion of Queen Elizabeth. It was bigotted zeal alone,—the most absurd of prejudices, masked with reason,—the most criminal of passions, covered with the appearance of duty,—which seduced them into measures which were fatal to themselves, and had so nearly proved fatal to their country."

Sir Everard was much affected when sentence of death was passed upon him. Making a low bow to those on the bench, he said:—"If I could hear any of your lordships say you forgave me, I should go the more cheerfully to the gallows." To this all the lords present replied: "God forgive you! and we do." He was executed with the other conspirators on the 30th of January, 1606. He met his fate with calmness, and expressed his penitence on the scaffold for his offence.

Cecil, Earl of Salisbury.

BORN CIR. A. D. 1550.—DIED A. D. 1612.

ROBERT Cecil, the son of Elizabeth's favourite minister, was born about the year 1550. He was educated at St John's College, Cambridge. In the parliament of 1585 and 1586, he represented the city of Westminster; for several subsequent years he was returned for the county of Hertford. In 1591, he received the honour of knighthood from Elizabeth, and in 1596, was appointed secretary of state, to the great

mortification of the earl of Essex, who wished Sir Thomas Bodley promoted to that important office. Sir Robert appears to have successfully imitated the policy of his father; while Elizabeth lived he maintained himself in her good opinion, and was entrusted with the principal management of affairs; and on her death he contrived to establish himself in the same relation to her successor, with whom he had even ventured to carry on a secret correspondence during the latter years of Elizabeth's life.

He was the first of the late queen's ministers who proclaimed King James, and the first also who tendered his service to the new monarch, despite of Northumberland's opinion that habitual caution, and a kind of official decorum, would restrain him from declaring himself promptly and without reserve. He met the king at York, and was immediately confirmed by him in all the offices which he had held under Elizabeth, to the surprise of many who had anticipated a very different reception from James for the well-known rival and enemy of the unfortunate Essex. It is said that Cecil was not a little indebted on this occasion to the good offices of Sir Roger Aston, the king's barber, and Sir George Hume. Perhaps he was; at any rate he was much too good a courtier not to be above availing himself of any influence which could be brought to bear upon his master. But he hardly needed the help of others to ingratiate himself with James. He had already studied the character of the man with whom he was now to deal, and he took care that the features which he knew James would need and look for in his prime minister should be observable in himself. In a word, he suited himself so exactly to the temper of his new sovereign, that he almost instantly became indispensable to him, and was valued accordingly. James spent four days at Cecil's princely seat of Theobald before entering his capital, and was entertained with a magnificence which he had probably never witnessed before. "To speak of Lord Robert's cost to entertain him," says a contemporary writer, "were but to imitate geographers that set a little round O for a mighty province; words being hardly able to express what was done there indeed." In James's first creation of peers, on the 20th of May 1603, Cecil was made a baron. In August 1604, he was created Viscount Cranborne; and, in less than a year thereafter, earl of Salisbury.

It would appear, however, notwithstanding his own good fortune, that Cecil was not blind to the prejudices of his master, and shared in common with the English courtiers, those feelings of deep mortification and disgust with which they beheld James's puerilities and partialities. In a letter which he addressed to Sir John Harrington in 1603, he uses the following expressions:—"You know all my former steps: good knight, rest content, and give heed to one that hath sorrowed in the bright lustre of a court, and gone heavily even to the best seeming fair ground. 'Tis a great task to prove one's honesty and yet not spoil one's fortune. You have tasted as little hereof in our blessed queen's time, who was more than a man, and, in troth, sometimes less than a woman. I wish I waited now in her presence-chamber, with ease at my food and rest in my bed. I am pushed from the share of comfort, and know not where the winds and waves of a court will bear me; I know it bringeth little comfort on earth; and he is, I reckon, no wise man that looketh this way to heaven. We have much stir about councils, and more

about honours. Many knights were made at Theobald's during the king's stay at mine house, and more to be made in the city. My father had much wisdom in directing the state; and I wish I could bear my part so discreetly as he did. Farewell, good knight, but never come near London till I call you. Too much crowding doth not well for a cripple, and the king doth scant find room to sit himself, he hath so many *friends* as they choose to be called; and heaven prove they lie not in the end! In trouble, hurrying, feigning, suing, and such like mockers, I now rest your true friend."¹

Cecil was not always the cool and cautious statesman. In the following letter written by Donne, we have an interesting account of a violent altercation which took place betwixt him and the earl of Hertford, whose marriage with Lady Catherine Grey had transferred to their son, Lord Beauchamp, the claims of the Suffolk line to the crown of England. "I cannot yet serve you," says Donne, "with these books of which your letter spake. In recompence I will tell you a story which, if I had had leisure to have told it you when it was fresh—which was upon Thursday last—might have had some grace for the rareness, and would have tried your love to me, how far you would adventure to believe an improbable thing for my sake who relates it. That day in the morning, there was some end made by the earl of Salisbury and others, who were arbitrators in some differences between Hertford and Monteaule; Hertford was ill-satisfied in it, and declared himself so far as to say, he expected better usage, in respect not only of his cause but of his expense and service in his embassy; to which Salisbury replied, that considering how things stood between his majesty and Hertford-house at the king's entrance, the king had done him special favour in that employment of honour and confidence, by declaring in so public and great an act and testimony that he had no ill-affection towards him. Hertford answered, that he was then and ever an honest man to the king; and Salisbury said he denied not that, but yet solemnly repeated his first words again, so that Hertford seemed not to make answer, but, pursuing his own word, said, that whosoever denied him to have been an honest man to the king lied. Salisbury asked him if he directed that upon him; Hertford said, upon any who denied this. The earnestness of both was such, as Salisbury accepted it to himself, and made protestations before the lords present, that he would do nothing else before he had honourably put off that lie. Within an hour after Salisbury sent him a direct challenge by his servant Mr Knightly. Hertford required only an hour's leisure of consideration, (it is said it was only to inform himself of the especial danger of dealing with a counsellor;) but he returned his acceptation; and all circumstances were so clearly handled between them, that St James's was agreed for the place, and they were both come from their several lodgings, and upon the way to have met, when they were interrupted by such as from the king were sent to have care of it."

The earl's opposition to the court of Spain can hardly be called an interested measure, as it tended to bring him into collision with the king himself, whose predilections towards that quarter were very strong, and of course furnished a handle to sycophants to poison the royal ear

¹ Harrington's Nugæ, I. p. 344.

as respected Salisbury. Yet he managed his opposition so adroitly that all the efforts of the Spanish court were unable to dislodge him from his place and influence in the nation's counsels. The discovery of the gunpowder-plot gave him an immense advantage over the party in the interest of Spain, which he did not fail to employ as occasion served in exciting the fears and scruples of his master. Sir Henry Nevill, in a letter to Winwood written at this juncture, says, "My lord (Salisbury) hath gotten much love and honour this parliament by his constant dealing in matters of religion; some fruit of it was seen in his attendance to the installation, being such, as I dare avow, never subject had in any memory, I hope it will confirm and strengthen him in his good proceedings." The consequence of Salisbury's determined hostility to the catholics, was a conspiracy to assassinate him by a musket-shot from the Savoy as he was going in his barge to court; but the design proved abortive, or was relinquished.

The death of Sackville, earl of Dorset, made way for Salisbury's preferment to the office of lord-treasurer, which he occupied without resigning that of secretary of state. His promotion gave great satisfaction to the protestant party. He might now be regarded as the sole minister of England; the king was in his hands; and the opposition which he had to encounter was so feeble that it could not be expected to embarrass his movements while he acted with any energy. Unfortunately he was weakest in that department which most needed his reforming hand. The nation looked to him for reform in the finances, but James was plunged in debt to such an extent that perpetual supplies from his treasurer were absolutely necessary to the continuance of their friendship. In this state of things Salisbury endeavoured to make the most of the royal manors, which had hitherto been grossly mismanaged, and were in fact only partially surveyed. Thus far he acted wisely, and for the true interests of the crown. But when by a new regulation, as it was called, of the customs, without the concurrence of parliament, he nearly doubled that important branch of the royal revenue, he committed a fatal error, which, in fact, laid the foundation for those financial proceedings which led to the overthrow of the Stuart dynasty. Much allowance must be made for the difficulties of the minister's situation; but it is impossible to shelter him from the charge of imprudence and unfaithfulness to the national trust reposed in him, when he advised his sovereign to have recourse to the measure here alluded to. His exertions, however, enabled James to bear up under his accumulating difficulties, and probably but for having gratified his master on the all-important point of money, he would never have succeeded in wringing from him his reluctant consent to a treaty with Holland in 1609. Still it was with difficulty that the lord-treasurer met parliament in 1610. He did his best on this occasion to apologise for the extravagance of his master; and concluded by entreating the house not to deny its supplies to "the wisest of kings, the very image of an angel, that brought good tidings, and settled us in the fruition of all good things." The appeal was partially successful; but not before 'the good angel' himself had seconded the efforts of his minister in a very absurd speech. It was well, probably, for Salisbury's historical character that he did not attain the advanced age of his father. He died of a long and painful decay, at Marlborough, on the 24th of May,

1612, in the 51st year of his age. The general sentiment of the nation towards his memory was unfavourable. His hostility to Essex,—his arbitrary augmentation of the customs,—his revival of old feudal exactions,—his indulgence of James in his absurd notions of kingly prerogative,—and, above all, his assertion that the torture might lawfully be inflicted on free-born Englishmen, at their sovereign's pleasure,—were now remembered against him, and afforded too much scope for popular invective, and the libels of Weldon and Wilson. Yet the nation that deprecated his memory soon had reason to lament his loss. The lord-treasurership was intrusted to worse hands when the earl of Suffolk obtained it; and the joint-secretaryship of Sir Ralph Winwood and Sir Thomas Lake failed to support the true policy of Britain in the cabinet.

Salisbury married Elizabeth, sister to Brooke, Lord Cobham, by whom he had a son and a daughter. His descendant James, the seventh earl, was advanced to the title of marquess in 1789.

Henry, Prince of Wales.

BORN A. D. 1594.—DIED A. D. 1612.

PRINCE Henry Frederick, eldest son of King James, was born at Stirling castle on the 19th of February, 1594. The care of his person and early education was intrusted to the earl of Mar, and the dowager-countess his mother. It was one of James's many foibles that he and his queen lived habitually much apart. There was little in the temper and habits of either to promote their domestic happiness; and their children were allowed to grow up under the entire charge of others, and totally removed from the observation of their parents. They were, in fact, 'boarded out' in the families of different noblemen; James's only care being to provide the infant heir-apparent with an expensive establishment.

The prince's governanté is said to have been a woman of a very bad temper, and to have treated her young charge with great severity. This may have been the reason of his early removal from her tuition to that of Adam Newton, a learned Scotsman, who afterwards translated into Latin the king's discourse against Vorstius, and was rewarded for this and other services with a baronetcy and the deanery of Durham. About the same time James composed his 'Basilicon Doron; or, his majesty's instructions to his dearest son, Henry, the prince,'—a work in which he designed to impart such measures of political wisdom and 'king-craft' to the youth, as should qualify him for the task of governing a kingdom, should providence call him to it. The first impression of this work was confined to seven copies, and the printer was sworn to secrecy; but its pedantic author could not long rest satisfied with so hiding his light under a bushel, and ultimately favoured the world with a full edition of the 'Basilicon Doron.'

In the last year of Queen Elizabeth, the pope, foreseeing the probability of the young prince's mounting the throne of England, and anxious, doubtless, to have the forming of his mind and sentiments, proposed to his father to undertake the sole charge and direction of his

education ; and, as a means of inducing James to consent to the arrangement, engaged to advance him such sums of money as might be necessary for securing his succession to the throne of England. James, however, had still wisdom and virtue enough left to reject so insidious an offer. On the removal of the royal family to England, James thought proper to invest his son, at nine years of age, with the order of the garter, and to place him with a numerous and costly establishment of his own in one of the royal palaces. The prince's household consisted at first of seventy servants ; but their number was doubled the next year, and, in 1610, had swelled to the amount of four hundred and twenty-six persons.

Little, certainly, was to be expected from a pupil so situated as prince Henry. So early treated with all the deference paid to royalty, and surrounded with persons whose only interest it was to gain his ear and heart by gratifying his childish caprices to the utmost,—courted also by those who now looked forward to his wielding, at no distant period, the sceptre of England,—it would not have been wonderful had he given early manifestation of a temper every thing the reverse of amiable. But nature had done more for him than his guardians. From his cradle he had evinced uncommon sweetness of disposition and quickness of understanding ; and these qualities strengthened with his growth. Amongst those who narrowly watched the development of the young prince's character was M. la Boderic the French ambassador, who, in October, 1606, writes thus of him to his minister : “ None of his pleasures savour in the least of a child. He is a particular lover of horses and what belongs to them : but is not fond of hunting, and when he does engage in it, it is rather for the pleasure of galloping than for any which the dogs give him. He is fond of playing at tennis, and at another Scottish diversion very like mall, but always with persons elder than himself, as if he despised those of his own age. He studies two hours in the day, and employs the rest of his time in tossing the pike, or leaping, or shooting with the bow, or throwing the bar, or vaulting, or some other exercise of that kind ; and he is never idle. He is very kind to his dependents, supports their interests against all persons whatsoever, and urges all that he undertakes for them or others with such zeal as insures its success : for, besides his exerting his whole strength to compass what he desires, he is already feared by those who have the management of affairs, and especially by the earl of Salisbury, who appears to be greatly apprehensive of the prince's ascendancy ; as the prince, on the other hand, shows little esteem for his lordship.”

His moral dispositions were still more promising. He was ever assiduous in the performance of his public and private devotions. He strictly forbade all profane swearing in his household, and readily associated with the more religiously inclined of the nobility, especially with the amiable Sir John Harrington, son, and for a short time successor to the first Lord Harrington of Exon. Sir Charles Cornwallis has left us the following interesting anecdote of the young prince : “ Once when the prince was hunting the stag, it chanced the stag, being spent, crossed the road where a butcher and his dog were travelling. The dog killed the stag, which was so great that the butcher could not carry him off. When the huntsman and the company came up, they fell at odds with the butcher, and endeavoured to incense the prince against him, to

whom the prince soberly answered, 'What if the butcher's dog killed the stag, what could the butcher help it?' They replied, if his father had been served so, he would have sworn so as no man could have endured it. 'Away!' replied the prince, 'all the pleasure in the world is not worth an oath.' In the management of his extensive household, he betrayed equal generosity and prudence. While he allowed no really meritorious servant to pass unnoticed, he sternly reprov'd every offender. "Whatever abuses," says Cornwallis, "were represented to him, he immediately redressed, to the entire satisfaction of the parties aggrieved. In his removal from one of his houses to another, and in his attendance on the king on the same occasions, or in progresses, he would suffer no provisions or carriages to be taken up for his use, without full contentment given to the parties. And he was so solicitous to prevent any person from being prejudiced or annoyed by himself or any of his train, that whenever he went out to hunt or hawk before the harvest was ended, he would take care that none should pass through the corn, and, to set them an example, would himself ride rather a furlong about."

To these amiable qualities he added an active and inquiring mind, ever bent on adding to its acquisitions, and exploring all possible sources of knowledge. "He loved and did mightily strive to do somewhat of every thing, and to excel in the most excellent. He greatly delighted in all kinds of rare inventions and arts, and in all kinds of engines belonging to the wars, both at land and sea,—in shooting and levelling great pieces of ordnance,—and in ordering and marshalling of armies,—in building and in gardening,—in all sorts of rare music, chiefly the trumpet and drum,—in sculpture, limning, and carving,—and in all sorts of excellent and rare pictures, which he had brought unto him from all countries."²

From a prince so well-endowed, so amiable, and so energetic, much was to be expected; the father's failings contributed, likewise, to cause the nation centre its hopes for the future in the son. "The palpable partiality," says Osborne, "that descended from the father to the Scots, did excite the whole love of the English upon his son, Henry, whom they engaged by so much expectation, as it may be doubted whether it ever lay in the power of any prince, merely human, to bring so much felicity into a nation as they did all his life propose to themselves at the death of King James."

All these high hopes, however, were soon blighted. In the spring of 1612, the young prince's health began to decline. Lingard takes care to inform us that some writers attributed this to the prince's debauchery, but is pleased to add that he regards the opinion of others who traced the prince's early decline to his own 'turbulence and obstinacy'³ as the more probable. He has adduced no proofs, however, either of Henry's debauchery or his turbulence: if by the latter term we are to understand any thing more than the natural sprightliness and activity of a youth of nineteen years of age. As to the prince's debauchery, we are at a loss to conceive upon what authority worthy of a national historian, Lingard has condescended to repeat such an insinuation, in the face of the most direct and positive evidence that the prince's habits were the reverse of every thing implied in the term.

² Cornwallis.³ Hist. of Eng., vol. vi. p. 98.

He expired on the 6th of November, 1612. The disease of which he died was a putrid fever which, acting upon a constitution already weakened, and aggravated by injudicious medical treatment, cut him off in a short time. His death was bewailed by the whole nation, and most of the poets of the day hastened to strew their voluntary offerings on his tomb. The charge which has been insinuated, that Henry was poisoned by the wicked Rochester, though very generally believed at the time, seems, upon the whole, as improbable as the still darker one of his father having been privy to the crime.

John, Lord Harrington.

BORN A. D. 1591.—DIED A. D. 1613.

THIS amiable youth was the eldest son of that Lord Harrington, to whose care King James committed the education of his daughter Elizabeth. He is styled by Gataker, in his ‘Discourse Apologetical,’ “a mirror of nobility,” and Dr Birch has made honourable mention of him in his life of Prince Henry. While yet a boy, he was distinguished for the extent, variety, and accuracy of his learning. He was an accomplished classical scholar, and spoke French and Italian with fluency. During a tour which he made on the continent, accompanied by Mr Tovey, ‘a grave and learned man,’ he is said to have excited the deadly enmity of the Jesuits, by his ardent attachment to the reformed doctrines, and his bold and eager avowal of them in public; and it was supposed that his premature death was occasioned by poison which had been administered to him by some of these ecclesiastics during his residence abroad. His tutor, Mr Tovey, is said to have been poisoned at the same time, and to have died in consequence soon after his return to England, although Lord Harrington’s more youthful and vigorous constitution resisted the effects of the deadly draught longer. It is extremely probable that the whole of this statement may be referred to the violent religious prejudices and antipathies of the times. While in Italy and the Venetian States, “those schools of impurity, whence few return such as they went out, he spent not his time,” says the author of the ‘*Nugæ Antiquæ*,’ “in courting of ladies and contemplating the beauty of women; but he preferred his books before their beauty, and, for his society, chose men of parts and learning for arts and arms. Besides, he was very temperate in his diet, frequent in fasting, and hated idleness and much sleep.” On succeeding to the family title and estates, he honourably discharged all the debts which his father had contracted by his magnificent style of housekeeping. But the splendour of his religion outshone all his moral and natural accomplishments. He was eminently and deeply pious, spending the greater part of the day in religious meditation and exercises, and devoting the tenth part of his income to charitable purposes. He died in 1613, in the 22d year of his age. His estate descended to his two sisters, Lucy, countess of Bedford, and Anne, wife of Sir Robert Chichester.

Sir Thomas Overbury.

BORN CIRC. A. D. 1581.—DIED A. D. 1613.

SIR THOMAS OVERBURY, the son of Nicholas Overbury of Bourton-on-the-hill, in Gloucestershire, was born at Compton-Scorfen, about the year 1581. He distinguished himself while a student at Oxford, by his successful pursuit of the logic and philosophy of the day. On leaving the university, he entered the Middle Temple, and devoted himself for a time to the study of the municipal law, previous to his going abroad. He spent several years on the continent, where he accomplished an extensive tour. On his return home, he attracted the notice of James' minion, Rochester, who made him his secretary, and in 1608, procured for him the honour of knighthood. Overbury was a man of very considerable natural powers, and had greatly improved his talents by observation and travel; he proved an able counsellor, and was soon regarded by his patron as 'an oracle of wisdom.' His rash and presumptuous temper, however, soon blighted the hopes of a political career begun under such favourable auspices. He had early incurred the displeasure of James for an insult offered to the queen, but Rochester's influence sufficed to screen him from more unpleasant consequences at the moment, and his influence continued to be courted by all who had favours to solicit from that dispenser of court-patronage, up to the very day of his arrest and committal to the tower.

The occasion of his fall was a criminal intrigue betwixt Rochester and the Lady Frances Howard, the eldest daughter of the lord-chamberlain, Suffolk. "No sooner," says Hume, "had James mounted the throne of England, than he remembered his friendship for the unfortunate families of Howard and Devereux, who had suffered for their attachment to the cause of Mary and to his own. Having restored young Essex to his blood and dignity, and conferred the titles of Suffolk and Northampton on two brothers of the house of Norfolk, he sought the farther pleasure of uniting these families by the marriage of the earl of Essex with Lady Frances Howard, daughter of the earl of Suffolk. She was only thirteen, he fourteen years of age; and it was thought proper, till both should attain the age of puberty, that he should go abroad and pass some time in his travels. He returned into England after four years' absence, and was pleased to find his countess in the full lustre of beauty, and possessed of the love and admiration of the whole court. But, when the earl approached, and claimed the privileges of a husband, he met with nothing but symptoms of aversion and disgust, and a flat refusal of any farther familiarities. He applied to her parents, who constrained her to attend him into the country, and to partake of his bed: but nothing could overcome her rigid sullenness and obstinacy, and she still rose from his side without having shared the nuptial pleasures. Disgusted with reiterated denials, he at last gave up the pursuit, and separating himself from her, thenceforth abandoned her conduct to her own will and discretion.

"Such coldness and aversion in Lady Essex arose not without an attachment to another object. The favourite had opened his addresses,

and had been too successful in making impression on the tender heart of the young countess. She imagined, that so long as she refused the embraces of Essex, she never could be deemed his wife, and that a separation and divorce might still open the way for a new marriage with her beloved Rochester. Though their passion was so violent, and their opportunities of intercourse so frequent, that they had already indulged themselves in all the gratifications of love, they still lamented their unhappy fate, while the union between them was not entire and indissoluble. And the lover as well as his mistress, was impatient, till their mutual ardour should be crowned by marriage.

“So momentous an affair could not be concluded without consulting Overbury, with whom Rochester was accustomed to share all his secrets. While that faithful friend had considered his patron’s attachment to the countess of Essex merely as an affair of gallantry, he had favoured its progress; and it was partly owing to the ingenious and passionate letters which he dictated, that Rochester had met with such success in his addresses. Like an experienced courtier, he thought that a conquest of this nature would throw a lustre on the young favourite, and would tend still farther to endear him to James, who was charmed to hear of the amours of his court, and listened with attention to every tale of gallantry. But great was Overbury’s alarm, when Rochester mentioned his design of marrying the countess; and he used every method to dissuade his friend from so foolish an attempt. He represented how invidious, how difficult an enterprize it would be to procure her a divorce from her husband: How dangerous, how shameful, to take into his own bed a profligate woman, who, being married to a young nobleman of the first rank, had not scrupled to prostitute her character, and to bestow favours on the object of a capricious and momentary passion. And, in the zeal of friendship, he went so far as to threaten Rochester, that he would separate himself for ever from him, if he could so far forget his honour and his interest as to prosecute the intended marriage.

“Rochester had the weakness to reveal this conversation to the countess of Essex; and when her rage and fury broke out against Overbury, he had also the weakness to enter into her vindictive projects, and to swear vengeance against his friend, for the utmost instance which he could receive of his faithful friendship. Some contrivance was necessary for the execution of their purpose. Rochester addressed himself to the king, and after complaining that his own indulgence to Overbury had begotten in him a degree of arrogance which was extremely disagreeable, he procured a commission for his embassy to Russia; which he represented as a retreat for his friend, both profitable and honourable. When consulted by Overbury, he earnestly dissuaded him from accepting this offer, and took on himself the office of satisfying the king if he should be anywise displeased with the refusal. To the king again, he aggravated the insolence of Overbury’s conduct, and obtained a warrant for committing him to the Tower, which James intended as a slight punishment for his disobedience. The lieutenant of the Tower was a creature of Rochester’s, and had lately been put into the office for this very purpose: he confined Overbury so strictly, that the unhappy prisoner was debarred the sight of even his nearest relations; and no communication of any kind was allowed with him during near six months which he lived in prison.” So closely were these orders ob-

served, that Winwood informs us, Sir Robert Killigrew "was committed to the Fleet, from the council table, for having some little speech with Sir Thomas Overbury, who called to him as he passed by his window, as he came from visiting Sir Walter Raleigh."

Soon after the committal of Overbury to the Tower, proceedings were commenced by the guilty lovers for procuring a divorce between the earl of Essex and his countess, on the pretence of physical incapacity on the part of the husband. The earl himself eagerly embraced the only expedient which seemed to offer itself for getting rid of a bad woman, by whom he knew himself to be hated, and whom he had long ceased to love. The king also lent himself to the disgraceful transaction, and exerted himself in the progress of the suit with the warmth and partiality of an advocate. A special court of delegates was appointed for the trial, and every means used which bribery or intimidation could effect to obtain the wished-for divorce. Yet, after the most strenuous exertions of all parties, it was only by a majority of seven to five that the marriage of the earl and countess of Essex was pronounced null. Overbury lived not to be made acquainted with the judgment. On the preceding day he expired in prison, with evident symptoms of having had poison administered to him.

Two years after 'the whole labyrinth of guilt' connected with the death of the unhappy prisoner was unravelled. An apothecary's apprentice, who had been employed in making up certain poisons for Elwes, the governor of the Tower, had stated this fact in public, and Elwes himself had made some very incautious avowals to the earl of Shrewsbury. Secretary Winwood conveyed the intelligence to the king, who ordered Sir Edward Coke to make the most rigorous and unbiassed scrutiny into the whole affair. The lord-chief-justice executed his task with more than ordinary zeal. But, while the accomplices in Overbury's murder, Weston, Turner, Franklin, and Elwes, received the punishment due to their crime, the principals themselves, Somerset and his countess, were pardoned, and restored to liberty.

Sir Thomas Overbury was the author of several works both in prose and verse, which were very popular in those days. His 'Characters, or Witty Descriptions of the properties of Sundry Persons,' are written in a quaint but lively style, and show him to have been an acute observer of character and manners, with a quick perception of the ludicrous.

Egerton, Lord Ellesmere.

BORN A. D. 1540.—DIED A. D. 1617.

THIS eminent statesman and lawyer was the son of Sir Richard Egerton of Ridley in Cheshire. He was born about the year 1540. He went to Oxford in 1556, and after three years' study there, removed to Lincoln's inn, where he applied himself with great diligence to the study of the law. It is traditionally related of this young counsellor that the first favourable impression which he made at the bar arose out of the following circumstances:—He happened to be in court when a cause was trying, in which it appeared, that three graziers had placed a joint-deposit of a sum of money in the custody of a woman who lived

in Smithfield, upon condition that she was to account for it again to them upon their return to demand it together; but that one of the graziers soon after returned, and by persuading her that he had been commissioned by his two partners to receive the whole deposit, prevailed upon her to deliver up the whole sum which had been deposited in her hands, with which he immediately absconded. The other two partners instituted an action against the woman to recover their money, and judgment was likely to go against her, when Mr Egerton stepped forward, and solicited permission to speak on the point as *'amicus curiæ.'* Having obtained the permission of the judges, he recapitulated the conditions upon which the defendant had taken charge of the money, and these being allowed to be such as above stated, "then," said the young counsellor, "the defendant is ready to comply with the agreement. The plaintiffs only can be charged with any violation of it. Two of them have brought a suit against this woman for repayment of a sum of money, which, it appears by the agreement, she was only to pay to these two and to the remaining partner jointly, on their all coming together to demand it. Where, then, is the third partner? Why does he not appear? Why do not the plaintiffs bring their partner along with them? When they have done this, and so fulfilled their part of the compact, the defendant is ready to fulfil hers. But till then, I apprehend, she is entitled by law to remain the custodier of the deposit." This reasoning appeared so ingenious to the court that it turned the cause, and a verdict was found for the defendant.

On the 28th of June, 1581, Egerton was appointed solicitor-general, and in 1594 he was advanced to the dignity of attorney-general. These successive appointments were conferred upon him in consequence of his great legal proficiency. He was knighted soon after. Upon the death of Sir John Pickering, in May, 1596, the great seal of England was placed in his hands by Elizabeth, who is said to have conferred this high trust upon Egerton against the wishes of her prime minister.

Ellesmere was ever a zealous servant of the crown, yet he contrived to stand well with the public at the same time. Indeed few public characters have preserved a reputation so free from blemish. His conduct towards Essex was in the highest degree honourable and friendly; and had that unfortunate nobleman consented to be guided by the advices of the lord-keeper, after his rupture with Elizabeth, there is little reason to doubt that he would have escaped his untimely fate.

On James's approach to London, to receive the crown of England, the lord-keeper waited upon him at Broxbourn, in Hertfordshire, and was confirmed for the present in his office. He was at the same time gratified "for his good and faithful services," with the title of Baron Ellesmere. On the day before James's coronation he was appointed lord-chancellor of England, which high office he filled for more than twelve years with equal dignity, learning, and impartiality. "Surely," says Lloyd, "all Christendom afforded not a person which carried more gravity in his countenance and behaviour than Sir Thomas Egerton, insomuch that many have gone to the chancery on purpose only to see his venerable garb—happy they who had no other business—and were highly pleased at so acceptable a spectacle. Yet was his outward case nothing in comparison of his inward abilities, quick wit, solid judgment, ready utterance." Lord Ellesmere was chosen chancellor

of the university of Oxford on the death of Archbishop Bancroft. He proved a munificent and discerning patron of literature and learned men; among others, Archbishop Williams owed his first advancement to him, and Sir Francis Bacon enjoyed his patronage.

In 1615, a fierce attack was made upon him by the lord-chief-justice, Coke, in consequence of his repealing a judgment at common law, and committing the defendants to prison for contempt of court on their refusing to obey his orders. Coke threatened him and the whole chancery with a *præmunire* in the Star chamber, upon the statutes 27^o Edward III. and 4^o Henry IV., for granting relief in equity after judgment had been given in the king's bench;¹ but the lord-chancellor vindicated his own proceedings with great spirit; and the matter being referred to the king's attorney, solicitor, and sergeant, they were of opinion that these statutes did not extend to the court of chancery.

In May, 1616, he was constituted lord-high-steward for the trial of the earl of Somerset and his wretched wife, on the charge of procuring Sir Thomas Overbury's death in the Tower by poison. After their conviction, he resolutely refused to affix the great seal to the extraordinary pardon which James "of his mere motion and special favour," chose to grant these illustrious criminals. Lingard represents Ellesmere as clinging with the most vexatious pertinacity to the emoluments of office, though his age and infirmities admonished him to retire. This is not a fair representation. Long before he finally retired from public life, he had solicited his release from the toils and cares of office from the king, and that too from a scrupulous apprehension of his incompetence to bear its fatigues and discharge its important duties as he ought to do, as well as from a becoming desire to devote the evening of his long life to serious preparation for its close. These sentiments he conveyed to the king, at two different times, in letters; and it was only with the greatest reluctance that James at last consented to accept his resignation. On the 7th of November, 1616, he was advanced to the dignity of Viscount Brackley, and on the 3d of March following, at his own special request, the seals were placed in the hands of Sir Francis Bacon. He died within twelve days thereafter. On his death-bed he frequently made use of the apostolic expression, "*Cupio dissolvi et esse cum Christo!*"

Sir Ralph Winwood.

BORN CIR. A. D. 1565.—DIED A. D. 1617.

SIR RALPH WINWOOD, "a gentleman well-seen in most affairs, but most expert in matters of trade and war," was born about the year 1565, at Aynho, in Northamptonshire. He studied at Oxford, and was proctor of that university in 1592. In 1599, he attended Sir Henry Neville to France, in the capacity of secretary; and, during Sir Henry's absence from Paris, was appointed English resident there. In 1603, he was sent to the States of Holland by James I. In 1607, he was knighted, and appointed joint-ambassador with Sir Richard Spencer to the States.

¹ Bacon, vi. 84; Cabala, 31, 33.

When James' theological zeal was roused by Vorstius treatise on the Nature and Attributes of the Deity, he employed Winwood to signify to the States his royal displeasure with the professor. Winwood executed the singular commission with all zeal, knowing that he could not adopt a more effectual method of recommending himself to his master than by gratifying his ostentatious pedantry to the very utmost. For a time the States resisted both James and his ambassador, but the importunity of the latter at last prevailed, and poor Vorstius was driven from his chair. He rendered a better service to his country in the discovery which he made of Sir Thomas Overbury's poisoning.

In 1614, Winwood was made secretary of state, in which office he continued till his death, which occurred in 1617. His state-papers, or 'Memorials,' were collected, and published in three volumes folio, in 1725. They throw little light on the secretary's character, but sufficiently evince him to have been an industrious pains-taking servant of the crown. Lloyd, in his usual style, says, "the natures and dispositions, the conditions and necessities, the factions and combinations, the animosities and discontents, the ends and designs of most people were clear and transparent to this watchful man's intelligence and observation, who could do more to King James by working on his fear, than others by gainsaying his pleasure."

Sir Walter Raleigh.

BORN A. D. 1552.—DIED A. D. 1618.

THIS distinguished statesman and writer, who flourished in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I., was born in the year 1552, at Hayes, a farm rented by his father, in the parish of Budely, Devonshire. The patrimonial estate was Fardell near Plymouth. The family-name was one of antiquity, but seems to have varied in its orthography from RALE or RALEGA, to RALEGH, RAULEIGH, or RALEIGH, in which latter form it is generally written. The mother of Sir Walter Raleigh, and the third wife of his father, was the daughter of Sir Philip Champernon of Modbury. At the age of sixteen, he entered as a commoner both at Oriel college and Christ-church, Oxford, and he continued in the university three years. It is doubtful whether he ever was—as has been generally supposed—a student of the Middle Temple; Hooker says that he spent in France "a good part of his youth in wars and military services," and that he was trained "not part but wholly gentleman, wholly soldier." His first military service was performed in France as a gentleman volunteer, in the corps of his maternal uncle, Henry Champernon. In 1575, he returned to England, but resumed his military career under Sir John Norris, in the Netherlands. In 1578, he accompanied his half-brother, Sir Humphrey Raleigh, in a voyage of adventure to Newfoundland, which proved, upon the whole, disastrous. On his return, he was employed, under the earl of Ormond, governor of Munster, in quelling the rebellion, which had broken out in that province,—a piece of service in which Raleigh seems to have evinced less of humanity than marked his subsequent character.

Upon the subjugation of the principal rebels, Raleigh returned to England in 1582, and was very favourably received at court, uniting as he did to a claim for distinguished public services, the attractions of a noble figure and well-endowed mind. His graces and accomplishments pleased 'the maiden queen,' and by one adroit act of gallantry, he effectually established himself in her favour, if not her confidence. Meeting the queen near a marshy spot, and observing her majesty hesitating to proceed, Raleigh instantly spread his rich cloak on the ground for a footcloth to his royal mistress,—a compliment which Elizabeth was fully able to feel and appreciate. Having ventured to write upon a window, which the queen could not fail to pass, this line, "Fain would I climb, but yet I fear to fall," Elizabeth is said, upon observing it, to have instantly written beneath it, "If thy heart fail thee, climb not at all."

In 1583, Raleigh was employed by the queen to attend Simier, the agent of the duke of Anjou, at that time aspiring to the honour of her hand, and afterwards to attend the duke to Antwerp. But we find him soon after engaging in a second voyage to Newfoundland, in conjunction with Sir Humphrey Gilbert. The ship, however, in which Raleigh sailed from Plymouth had not been many days at sea before a contagious fever broke out amongst the crew, and the vessel was obliged to return to harbour, whilst Sir Humphrey, with the rest of the fleet, pursued their course to Newfoundland, and planted the first British colony there. Raleigh's attention was still turned to maritime discovery; and, at his own risk, he fitted out two vessels, which he despatched by the Canaries and West Indies, and which, after a voyage of more than two months, reached the gulf of Florida, and took possession of the country now called Virginia and Carolina, in the name of the queen of England. The first expedition which Raleigh undertook in person to Virginia was rewarded by knighthood. Shortly afterwards, we find Raleigh engaged with the celebrated Davis, and others, in an association for the discovery of the north-west passage.

In 1584, Raleigh was chosen to represent the county of Devon in parliament; and subsequently obtained, with other privileges, a grant of twelve thousand acres of the forfeited lands in Cork and Waterford. He was now in the hey-day of prosperity; but he did not give way to indolence, or luxurious habits of any kind. His application to study was intense; to reading he is said to have assigned four hours; to sleep five only; to relaxation, two, and the remainder of the day to business. It was an honourable trait in Sir Walter's character, that he was ever ready to patronize merit in others, and that he sought not to monopolize the knowledge which his talents and industry enabled him to acquire. He supported Morgeres, an eminent French painter, during his residence in England, for the purpose of making maps and drawings of Florida. He was the friend and patron of Richard Hakluyt, and assisted that industrious compiler in forming and publishing his collection of English voyages. He received Thomas Herriot, an ingenious mathematician, into his house, and paid him a yearly salary for instructions in mathematical science; and, with a view to promote the circulation of knowledge, he set up an office of inquiry to which the industrious and curious in every department of science or art might apply for information of every species.

His natural love of enterprize, animated by the fresh fame of Hawkins and of Drake, incited Raleigh to repeat his expeditions of discovery ; but his schemes were conceived on too magnificent a scale for his own resources, and met with little patronage from Elizabeth, whose attention was indeed drawn to objects nearer home and of more pressing emergency. Having signalized himself against the Spanish armada, and in assisting Don Antonio, king of Portugal, against the king of Spain, we find him visiting Ireland, and inducing the poet Spencer to repair to the English court. In 1590, he collected, chiefly at his own expense, a fleet of thirteen vessels, with which, having been joined by two of the queen's men-of-war, he undertook a successful cruise against the Spaniards in the West Indies. We next find him devoting himself to the civil interests of his country, and gaining a purer and more imperishable renown in the senate than in the field. To the encroaching spirit of the established clergy he opposed his influence in many cases ; and when Udall was capitally convicted of a libel on the queen's majesty in his 'Demonstration of Discipline,' a reprieve and subsequently a commutation of sentence was obtained for the unfortunate man at the intercession of Raleigh. He also zealously exerted himself in opposing the arbitrary laws enacted against the Brownists, the Catholics, and other sectarians, upon the score of religious principles, for which conduct the cry of Atheist, accompanied with various other insinuations, was raised against him by the high church party.

In 1533, Raleigh married Elizabeth Throgmorton, one of the ladies of the bed-chamber, whose fair fame had already lain under impeachment on his account. Their union, however, though marked by vicissitudes, was cheered by their uninterrupted affection. In 1596, Raleigh, though still in disgrace as a courtier, on account of his intrigue with the above lady, was appointed third in command of the fleet sent to the coast of Spain to anticipate a threatened second armada. In this service he highly distinguished himself, but gained little more than wounds and honour. On his return to England, he projected an expedition to Guiana, "that mighty rich and beautiful empire," and to "that great and golden city which the Spaniards call El Dorado." At his own charge he prepared a squadron of five ships, and, in 1595, sailed from Plymouth. His expedition, however, resulted in little else than a more extensive investigation of the country than had hitherto been made ; but his sanguine temperament and lively fancy led him to pen such a description of his researches in Guiana as almost entitles us to call in question his veracity. Thus, alluding to the mineral productions of Guiana, he thus expresses himself in the narrative of his voyage :—"For the rest, which myself have seen, I will promise those things that follow, and know to be true. Those who are desirous to discover and to see many nations may be satisfied within this river (Oronooko), which bringeth forth so many arms and branches, leading to several countries and provinces about 2,000 miles east and west, and 800 miles north and south, and of these the most rich either in gold or in other merchandises. The common soldier shall here fight for gold, and pay himself instead of pence, with plates of half a foot broad, whereas he breaketh his bones in other wars for provant and penury."

He tells us also of a tribe in Guiana "having their eyes in their shoulders, and their mouths in the middle of their breasts, and a long

train of hair growing backward between their shoulders," which, he continues, "though it may be thought a mere fable, yet, for mine own part, I am resolved it is true, because every child in the provinces of Arromaia and Cameri affirms the same." Whatever may be thought of the credulity, or, as some would say, the falsehood manifested in these and other marvellous extracts, which may be abundantly gleaned from his account of Guiana, it is certain that not only preceding but subsequent travellers in that country have brought back as wonderful accounts of what they had seen; and some of the latter commend, in very high terms, the "effectual and faithful account" given by Raleigh. Such is the innate disposition of the human mind to magnify imperfectly known and distant objects. Raleigh's representations failed indeed to engage the queen in his scheme for conquering Guiana, but the intrepidity and skill which he had displayed in his voyage to that country served to reinstate him in the favour of his royal mistress, who again appointed him third in command in her last naval undertaking against the Spaniards. The 'Island-voyage,' as it was called, though well concerted, was totally unsuccessful, as far as regarded its main object, and led to a serious misunderstanding betwixt Sir Walter and the earl of Essex, whilst it seriously diminished the popularity of both. The death of the lord-treasurer, Burleigh, deprived Essex of his best and most powerful friend, and enabled Raleigh more effectually to displace his rival in the good graces of the queen. In 1600, he received a substantial proof of his royal mistress's favour, in his appointment to the governorship of Jersey. On the apprehension of Essex, it was expected by some that Raleigh would use his influence with the queen to procure the pardon of his rival; but it does not appear that he made any attempt of the kind, and on the supposed fact of his neutrality in the case, a strong charge of malignity towards Essex has been preferred against him, although, as his latest biographer well remarks, "for omissions of a virtuous act, no public man, in those days of peril, could, however, with propriety, be censured. Every favoured courtier had his foes, who might give an invidious colouring to any behest, however innocent. Elizabeth was arbitrary, almost despotic, and, in her seasons of irritation, neutrality was the only safe course. 'Blessed are they,' said an eye-witness of her court, 'that can be away, and live contented.' Such, probably, was the pervading sentiment of all who viewed closely the cares and heart-rending vicissitudes of that chequered scene." In his defence, Essex endeavoured to implicate Cobham, Cecil, and Raleigh. To this charge the two former personally replied; but Raleigh intrusted the defence of his own conduct to Francis, Lord Bacon. It is difficult wholly to acquit Raleigh of all the charges which have been brought against him in the affair of Essex; it is certain that he, as well as the queen, never regained the popular favour after the execution of that unfortunate nobleman. During the latter years of Elizabeth's reign, Raleigh appears to have affected a life of retirement, employing himself in various literary labours, and cultivating the acquaintance of the poets, wits, and scholars of the age, among whom were Shakspeare, Beaumont, Fletcher, Jonson, Selden, Cotton, Carew, Martin, and Donne.

The accession of James to the throne prepared the way for the downfall of Raleigh. He was at first graciously treated by the king, but was

soon deprived of his office of captain of the guard, and ultimately dismissed from court. Such unworthy treatment was keenly felt by the high-spirited Raleigh, who, in the height of his chagrin and indignation, allowed his better judgment to become so far obscured as to become a party in the wild and unintelligible conspiracy for altering the succession to the crown, historically known by the name of "Raleigh's plot," although the actual extent of Raleigh's participation in it is by no means clear. Accused by the wretched Cobham of having been the prime instigator in this singular piece of treason, Raleigh was committed to the tower, and, in the bitterness of his spirit, attempted to commit suicide by stabbing himself in the breast with a knife. Happily for his own reputation, the wound was not dangerous. On the 17th of Nov., 1603, Raleigh's trial commenced at Winchester, whither the court had retired to avoid the plague then ravaging the metropolis. The indictment charged him with having conspired to dethrone the king, to stir up sedition, to introduce the Romish religion, and to procure a foreign invasion of the kingdom. It further charged him with having composed a book against the king's title, and instigated the lady Arabella Stuart to write three letters to foreign princes, with the view of persuading them to support her title. Sir Edward Coke, as attorney-general, headed the prosecution, and the subservient jury returned a verdict of guilty, although the only fact proved against him was his having listened to proposals made by Cobham of a bribe from Spain, if he would further the peace between that power and England,—a proposal to which he had only replied, "When I see the money, I will tell you more." Raleigh admitted that some conversation had passed between him and Cobham on the subject of a bribe from Spain to promote a peace between the two countries, but denied that he had ever connected himself with the Spanish faction. "Presumptions," he said, "must proceed from precedent or subsequent facts. I, that have always condemned the Spanish faction, methinks it a strange thing that now I should affect it!" He entreated them to produce the only witness against him: "Let Lord Cobham be sent for," he said, "Call my accuser before my face, and I have done! Charge him on his soul, and on his allegiance to the king; and, if he affirm it, let me be taken to be guilty." On the jury returning a verdict of guilty, Raleigh calmly observed, "They must do as they are directed!" Sentence of death, with confiscation of property, was passed against him, but was not carried into immediate execution; meanwhile he was remanded back to the tower. In this situation Raleigh amused himself with the study of chemistry, and with music and painting, beside employing himself in his great work, the 'History of the World,' perhaps the most extraordinary literary work ever accomplished in such circumstances. In his scientific and literary pursuits, he found a young and liberal patron in Prince Henry of Wales, the heir apparent to the throne, who obtained access to him in the tower, and who was heard to observe, that "none but his father would keep such a bird in such a cage." At his earnest solicitation, his wife and son were allowed to reside with him, and in 1604, his younger son was born in the Tower, and christened Carew—probably in honour of Lord Carew, a relative and friend of his father's. Though his estates in general were preserved to him, yet the rapacity of Car, earl of Somerset, the king's minion, deprived him of his fine

manor of Sherborne, upon the plea of a flaw in his prior conveyance of it to his son.

At last, on the 17th of March, 1615, after twelve years confinement, Sir Walter obtained his liberation through the mediation of Villiers, the new favourite, whose good offices he purchased for the sum of fifteen hundred pounds. He now revived his Guiana project, but the period was most inauspicious, on account of the Spanish influence over the king and court. The king not only withheld his countenance from the undertaking, but even communicated the particulars of Raleigh's project to the Spanish ambassador. Raleigh embarked his whole fortunes and those of his wife in this expedition, and through the mediation of Sir Ralph Winwood obtained a commission constituting him admiral of the fleet, and authorizing him to found a settlement in Guiana, with the necessary powers for that purpose. On the 28th of March, 1618, Raleigh's fleet sailed down the Thames, having on board his eldest son, a captain, and two hundred volunteers, eighty of whom were gentlemen by birth, but many of them of disreputable character. After encountering many difficulties, the expedition reached the continent of South America in November. He immediately despatched the most inter-prizing of his followers up the Oronooko river, where they were attacked by the Spaniards, who had been already apprised of their approach by intelligence from England. In the first action the Spaniards were driven out of their new town of St Thomas, but young Raleigh was killed. After an absence of two months, the exploring party rejoined Raleigh at Punto de Gallo, and a scene of mutual recrimination took place betwixt Captain Keymis and his principal, immediately after which the former, retiring to his cabin, shot himself through the ribs, and stabbed himself to the heart. It was now determined in a council of war to return to Newfoundland to repair and clean the ship; but on arriving at that island—a mutiny having broken out amongst his men—Raleigh instantly sailed for England. Spanish influence, however, had already ruined Raleigh's cause with the king, in so much so that, some weeks previous to his landing in England, a proclamation was issued against him, declaring the king's utter dislike and detestation of the violences and excesses said to have been committed upon the territories of his dear brother of Spain, and requiring all persons who could supply information upon the subject to repair to the privy council to make known their whole knowledge and understanding concerning the same. Raleigh, on arriving at Plymouth, was informed of the royal proclamation, but, conscious of his integrity, sent his sails ashore, moored his ship, and set out for London. Before reaching Ashburton, a town twenty miles from Plymouth, he was arrested by Sir Lewis Stukley, who carried him back to Plymouth. Here a plan was laid for enabling him to make his escape to France, and might have been carried into execution, had not Sir Walter himself ultimately determined on rejecting it. On being conducted to the metropolis, and learning from his friends and acquaintances the extent of the toils in which the machinations of his enemies had involved him, he entered into a fresh project for making his escape from the country, in which he was encouraged by the perfidious Stukley, with the express intention of betraying him to his enemies, a design in which he succeeded too well, the party being seized at Greenwich by the emissaries of Stukley, on the 10th of August, 1618,

Raleigh was again consigned to the Tower, and on the 28th of October, was brought before the court of king's bench, where his plea of an implied pardon in his last commission from the king was over-ruled. He was told that for the last fifteen years he had been a dead man in the eye of the law, and might at any moment have been led to the scaffold; that new offences had now stirred up his majesty's justice to revive what the law had formerly cast upon him, and that justice must now take its course. Sentence of death was now pronounced against him, but, as a favour, the mode of execution was changed from hanging to that of beheading. On the morning of the following day, October 29th, he met his doom in Old Palace yard. "The time of his execution," says John Aubrey, in one of his letters recently published from the Bodleian library, "was contrived to be on my Lord Mayor's day, that the pageants and fine shows might draw away the people from beholding the tragedie of one of the gallantest worthies that ever England bred." His behaviour at the scaffold was calm and intrepid even to cheerfulness. Having addressed the spectators, and bidden farewell to the noblemen and other friends who stood around him, he desired the executioner to show him the instrument of destruction. The man hesitating to comply, Sir Walter said, "I prythee let me see it: dost thou think that I am afraid of it?" Having passed his finger on the edge of the axe, he returned it, saying to the sheriff, "This is a sharp medicine, but it is a cure for all diseases." When asked as he laid his head on the block in which direction he would place it, he calmly answered, by observing, "that if the heart was right it were no matter which way the head was laid." By two strokes his head was severed from his body; it was afterwards given to Lady Raleigh, who bequeathed it to her son, Carew, in whose grave it was buried. His body was interred in the church of St Margaret, Westminster. The lines entitled 'Raleigh's Epitaph,' were given, according to Archbishop Sandcroft, by Sir Walter to one of his attendants the night before his execution. They are thus quoted in the Oxford edition of his works:

Even such is time, that takes on trust
 Our youth, our joys, our all we have,
 And pays us but with age and dust;
 Who in the dark and silent grave,
 When we have wandered all our ways,
 Shuts up the story of our days!
 But from this earth, this grave, this dust,
 The Lord shall raise me up, I trust.

The poetical effusion entitled 'The Farewell,' which is sometimes said to have been the composition of his last hours, was in print so early as the year 1608.

It has been justly said of Sir Walter that he was one of the very chief glories of an age crowded with towering spirits.¹

¹ Memoirs by Mrs Thomson. — Phillip's State Trials.

Brook, Lord Cobham.

DIED A. D. 1619.

JAMES, at his accession to the throne of England, found his council divided into two factions, mortal enemies to each other. The secretary, Cecil, with his colleagues, formed one of these parties; the earl of Northumberland, with the lords Gray and Cobham, and Sir Walter Raleigh composed the other. Of these latter personages, Northumberland paid the most successful court to the new monarch, and might have won his favour, but for the predominating influence of Cecil and his own rashness; but towards Cobham and Raleigh James ever manifested the most rooted dislike. In this situation, Raleigh engaged in the wild plot to raise Arabella Stuart to the throne of England. This unfortunate lady was the daughter and heiress, by a lady of the family of Cavendish, of Charles Stuart, the younger brother of Lord Darnley; and, in right of her grandmother, Margaret, countess of Lennox, daughter of the queen-dowager of Scotland, and niece of Henry VIII., stood next in succession to the English throne to James and his immediate posterity. Her claims were supported by Pope Clement VII., who aimed at a marriage betwixt Arabella and her brother, Cardinal Farnese, whom he proposed to secularise, in order to enable him to enter into the marriage relation. Cobham opened a negotiation with Aremberg, the ambassador from the Netherlands, the object of which was to obtain the countenance of Spain for Arabella's cause. In the meantime, a subordinate and equally wild plot, to seize the person of the king, was got up under the direction of Sir Griffin Markham, George Brook, the brother of Lord Cobham, and one Watson, a catholic missionary. The Lord Gray of Wilton was also persuaded to engage in Markham's enterprise.

These transactions were soon discovered by Cecil; and Cobham and Gray were, in consequence, arraigned before their peers. Cobham made a full confession of his guilt, but coupled it with the most abject solicitations for mercy; his fellow-prisoner disdained such meanness, and, by his noble bearing, as well as by the candour of his statements, won the esteem of the very judges by whom he was condemned. The other conspirators were likewise placed upon their trial, and sentence of death pronounced against them. But of the lay-conspirators Brook alone was executed. James had resolved to exhibit his royal clemency in union with a fine piece of king-craft on this occasion. We shall give Carlton's relation of this singular transaction:—

“Warrants were signed and sent to Sir Benjamin Tichborne, on Wednesday last at night, for Markham, Grey, and Cobham, who in this order were to take their turns as yesterday, being Friday, about ten of the clock Markham, being brought to the scaffold, was much dismayed, and complained much of his hard hap, to be deluded with hopes, and brought to that place unprepared. One might see in his face the very picture of sorrow; but he seemed not to want resolution; for a napkin being offered by a friend that stood by to cover his face, he threw it away, saying, he could look upon death without blushing. He took leave of some friends that stood near, and betook

himself to his devotions, after his manner ; and those ended, prepared himself to the block.

“The sheriff, in the mean time, was secretly withdrawn by one John Gib, a Scotch groom of the bed-chamber, whereupon the execution was stayed, and Markham left to entertain his own thoughts, which, no doubt, were as melancholy, as his countenance sad and heavy. The sheriff, at his return, told him, that since he was so ill prepared he should yet have two hours’ respite ; so led him from the scaffold, without giving him any more comfort, and locked him into the great hall to walk with Prince Arthur. The Lord Grey, whose turn was next, was led to the scaffold by a troop of the young courtiers, and was supported on both sides by two of his best friends ; and coming in this equipage had such gaiety and cheer in his countenance, that he seemed a dapper young bridegroom. At his first coming on the scaffold, he fell on his knees, and his preacher made a long prayer to the present purpose, which he seconded himself with one of his own making, which, for the phrase, was somewhat affected, and suited to his other speeches ; but, for the fashion, expressed the fervency and zeal of a religious spirit Being come to a full point, the sheriff stayed him, and said he had received orders from the king to change the order of the execution, and that the Lord Cobham was to go before him. Whereupon he was likewise led to Prince Arthur’s hall. . . .

“The Lord Cobham, who was now to play his part, and by his former actions promised nothing but *matiere pour rire*, did much cozen the world ; for he came to the scaffold with good assurance and contempt of death. He said some short prayers after his minister, and so out-prayed the company that helped to pray with him, that a stander by said, ‘He had a good mouth in a cry, but was nothing single.’ . . . For Sir Walter Raleigh, he took it upon the hope of his soul’s resurrection, that what he had said of him was true, and with these words would have taken a short farewell of the world. . . . He was stayed by the sheriff, and told, that there resteth yet somewhat else to be done, for that he was to be confronted with some other of the prisoners, but named none. So as Grey and Markham, being brought back to the scaffold, as they then were . . . looked strange one upon the other, like men beheaded and met again in the other world. Now all the actors being together on the stage (as use is at the end of a play), the sheriff made a short speech unto them, by way of the interrogatory of the heinousness of their offences, the justness of their trials, their lawful condemnation and due execution there to be performed, to all which they assented ; then saith the sheriff, ‘See the mercy of your prince, who, of himself, hath sent hither a countermand and given you your lives.’ There was no need to beg a *plaudite* of the audience, for it was given with such hues and cries, that it went from the castle into the town, and there began afresh, as if there had been some such like accident. . . .

“Raleigh, you must think (who had a window opened that way), had hammers working in his head to beat out the meaning of this stratagem. His turn was to come on Monday next ; but the king has pardoned him with the rest, and confined him with the two lords in the Tower of London, there to remain during pleasure. Markham, Brookesby and Copley are to be banished the realm. This resolution

was taken by the king without man's help, and no man can rob him of the praise of yesterday's action; for the lords knew no other but that the execution was to go forward, till the very hour it should be performed; and then, calling them before him, he told them how much he had been troubled to resolve in this business; for to execute Grey, who was a noble young spirited fellow, and save Cobham, who was as base and unworthy, were a manner of injustice. To save Grey, who was of a proud, insolent nature, and execute Cobham, who had shown great tokens of humility and repentance, were as great a solecism; and so went on with Plutarch's comparisons in the rest, still travelling in contrarieties, but holding the conclusion in so indifferent balance that the lords knew not what to look for till the end came out; 'and therefore I have saved them all.' The miracle was as great there as with us at Winchester, and it took like effect; for the applause that began about the king, spread from thence into the presence, and so round about the court."

Lord Grey expired in the Tower after a captivity of eleven years. Cobham was ultimately discharged from confinement; but his large estates were wholly confiscated, and he was forsaken not only by all the nobility, but even by Cecil who had married his sister, and his own wife who enjoyed a large independent income. He died in a miserable garret in 1619.

Sir John Davies.

BORN A. D. 1569.—DIED A. D. 1626.

SIR JOHN DAVIES, a poet of some repute, but a better lawyer, was the third son of John Davies of Tisbury, in Wiltshire. He studied at Oxford, and about the beginning of 1583, entered the Inner Temple, where, although he did not wholly neglect professional studies, his irregularities subjected him to repeated censure, and finally to expulsion from commons. He managed, however, to be called to the bar in 1595, but was soon after expelled by the unanimous sentence of the society, for an outrageous attack on a brother-barrister, within the precincts of Temple-hall. After this affair, Davies betook himself again to Oxford, where he is supposed to have written his poem on the 'Immortality of the Soul.' In the last parliament of Elizabeth, Davies sat as a member; it is not altogether clear by what means the profligate wit, and poet, and expelled barrister, contrived to effect this change in his fortunes; if he owed it to court-favour, and his adulatory acrostics on the words 'Elizabetha regina,' it must also be confessed that he commenced his political career like an independent man; he opposed monopolies, and vigorously asserted the privileges of the house against her majesty's servants. By such conduct, and suitable apologies, he regained his former rank in the Temple, and continued to advance in his profession until the accession of James I, opened up his way to preferment.

Having gone with Lord Hunsdon to Scotland, to congratulate the new king, James, who had been much pleased with one of Davies' poems, entitled 'Nosce Teipsum,' graciously embraced the author, and

assured him of his royal regard. The king kept his promise, for in 1603 we find Davies sent as solicitor-general to Ireland, and immediately after appointed attorney-general. On the 11th of February, 1607, he received the honour of knighthood. In 1612 he published the result of his personal observations in Ireland, under the title of 'A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued till the beginning of his majesty's reign.' This book has often been reprinted, and is a valuable historical and economical document. The same year, he represented the county of Fermanagh in the Irish parliament, and after a violent struggle between the catholic and protestant party, was chosen speaker of the house of commons. In 1615, he published the first reports of judgment in the king's courts of Ireland. In 1616 he returned to England. In 1620 he represented Newcastle-under-Line in parliament, and distinguished himself chiefly in debates on Irish affairs, in which he maintained, against Coke and others, that England could not make laws to bind Ireland which had an independent parliament of its own. He died suddenly on the 17th of December, 1626. His 'Tracts' were republished by Mr George Chalmers in 1786, with a life of the author. Davies was a man of sterling political integrity, and a clear-headed lawyer; as a poet he has perhaps been rated below his real merits; his versification is harmonious, and his images are often both moral and elegant. His 'Nosce Teipsum' has been pronounced by the editor of an edition of the English poets, "a noble monument of learning, acuteness, command of language, and facility of versification."

Foulk, Lord Brooke.

BORN A. D. 1554.—DIED A. D. 1628.

FULK, or FOULK, LORD BROOKE, the eldest son of Sir Fulk Greville of Beauchamp Court at Alcester, in the county of Warwick, was born in 1554. He received his grammar-school education at Shrewsbury. From Shrewsbury he went to Cambridge, and was admitted fellow-commoner of Trinity college. Sometime after he removed to the university of Oxford, and having finished his academic education, proceeded to the continent, where he took an extensive tour, and made himself master of every accomplishment that was requisite to fit him for the court of Elizabeth. On his return he was introduced to her majesty by his uncle, Robert Greville. His knightly accomplishments soon won the favour of the queen, and she was pleased both to confer upon him the honour of knighthood, and the office of clerk to the signet, in the court of marches for Wales. His kinsman Sir Henry Sidney was then lord-president of that court and the principality. This appointment took place about 1576 or 1577 when Sir Fulk was not more than twenty-two or twenty-three. But he was by no means satisfied with the nature of his employment, and sought a change. He desired chiefly to be employed in some diplomatic capacity, and made several attempts to raise his fortune by serving the queen in this way. But he was too forward and ready to engage in embassies even without the queen's consent, and on one occasion was remanded from Dover, even after he

had obtained leave ; but when another occasion offered, he actually stole away without permission, and in consequence so far incurred the queen's displeasure, that on his return she banished him from court for many months. It appears that Sir Fulk, notwithstanding his gentlemanly accomplishments, was guilty of frequently offending the high-spirited Elizabeth, who as frequently visited him with her displeasure,—but always as became a magnanimous princess. With Sir Philip Sidney, who was a very intimate friend, he had engaged to go out with Sir Francis Drake to the West Indies ; but the queen peremptorily forbade them both. They were distinguished ornaments of her court, and specially qualified to shine in those tilts and tournaments which were the courtly amusements of the age ; and she was unwilling at any time to bear their absence from her entertainments. In the 41st of Elizabeth he obtained the post of treasurer of marine causes for life ; and in 1599 a commission was ordered to be made out for him as rear-admiral of the fleet. In 1602, he obtained from the queen a grant of the ancient and spacious park belonging to the manor of Wedgnoock, which had been held by Ambrose Dudley, earl of Warwick, lately deceased. He also frequently represented the county of Warwick in parliament during Elizabeth's reign. He continued a favourite with her majesty till her death.

On the coronation of James I. that monarch made him knight of the Bath, confirmed to him his lucrative office in the court of marches, and bestowed upon him Warwick castle, with the manor of Knowle in the same county.

It seems that the jealousy of Sir R. Cecil now became an impediment to his advancing fortunes, and he in consequence retired to the duties of his office, and to the pursuits of literature. He devoted himself to composing a life of Queen Elizabeth, and made some progress in the work ; but being denied the use of some papers in the possession of the privy council, he abandoned his design, and amused himself with revising the political recreations of his youthful years. Having continued in retirement till the death of Cecil, he at once emerged from obscurity into the royal favour—became chancellor of the exchequer, was created Lord Brooke of Beauchamp court, and obtained abundant honours and privileges. Upon the accession of Charles I. he was confirmed in his offices and honours by the favour of that prince. About this period he endowed a lecture on history in the university of Cambridge, and soon after fell a sacrifice to the resentment of a discontented domestic. On the 30th of September 1628, one Ralph Haywood who had spent the greatest part of his life in his service, without receiving such compensation as he thought himself entitled to, took upon him to expostulate with his master in his bed-chamber ; upon which Lord Brooke severely and indignantly reprov'd him, and the altercation rising still higher, his lordship turned his back to go away, but the wretched menial instantly stabbed him in the back with a knife. He then fled into another room where he killed himself with the same weapon. His lordship was buried in St Mary's, Warwick.

Fulk Greville was unquestionably a most accomplished gentleman and courtier, one of the brightest ornaments of the English court, in the era of its proudest glory. His writings consist chiefly of certain elegant poems and miscellanies, comprising conversations with Sir Philip

Sidney. It is stated that he wrote a life of Sir Philip, but we presume it is only the short memoir prefixed to the 'Arcadia,' and signed Φιλολογιστος.

By will he directed his estates, &c. to go to ROBERT GREVILLE, a kinsman, who was made lord-lieutenant of Warwickshire by the parliament in the civil wars. He was a person of considerable learning, and took an active part in the commotions of that day. Being sent to attack Litchfield, he was shot in the eye, March 2, 1643. He was the writer of a work against episcopacy, entitled 'A Discourse opening the nature of that Episcopacy which is exercised in England,' 1641. 4to. This tract discovers much acuteness and a respectable knowledge of the argument, both as connected with Scripture and ecclesiastical antiquity. He was the author of another work entitled, 'The Nature of Truth, its union and unity with the soul,' &c. 12mo. He was a Millennarian and a visionary.

Villiers, Duke of Buckingham.

BORN A. D. 1592.—DIED A. D. 1628.

GEORGE VILLIERS, duke of Buckingham, the unworthy favourite of two kings, was born on the 20th of August, 1592, at Brookesby in Leicestershire, the seat of his father, Sir George Villiers. His mother was of the ancient family of Beaumont. In youth he betrayed little genius for letters, but greatly excelled in all personal accomplishments. His fine person and graceful manners introduced him to the favourable attention of James I. at the age of eighteen. "James," says Lord Clarendon, "though he was a prince of more learning and knowledge than any other of that age, and really delighted more in books and in the conversation of learned men, yet, of all wise men living, he was the most delighted and taken with handsome persons and fine clothes." The youth's mother artfully availed herself of this predilection, on the occasion of James's visit to Cambridge in 1615. Among the entertainments got up by the university for the royal gratification was a Latin comedy called *Ignoramus*, which took the king's fancy wonderfully. Young Villiers was one of the actors, and his appearance and performance so charmed the royal spectator, that he resolved, as Sir Henry Wotton says, "to make him a master-piece, and to mould him, as it were, Platonically to his own idea." Somerset was at this moment rapidly declining in the royal favour, or rather had entirely lost the affection of the capricious monarch. His enemies confidently anticipated his fall, and, with a view to accelerate it, resolved to support the new favourite, whose youth and giddy disposition they thought would render him a facile instrument for their own purposes. Abbot relates, that the queen, though sincerely solicitous for Somerset's overthrow, was at first extremely averse to the scheme by which it was now proposed to effect that object; and on his requesting her good offices on behalf of young Villiers, made use of these remarkable words: "My lord, you and the rest of your friends know not what you do; I know your master better than you all, for if this young man be once brought in, the first persons that he will plague must be you that labour for him; yea, I shall have my part also; the king will teach him to despise and hardly

entreat us all, that he may seem to be beholden to none but himself." The event proved how much more correctly the queen had studied James's character than the primate.

In April, 1616, James conferred the honour of knighthood on the rising favourite, who had already waited upon his person for some time in the character of cup-bearer. He was at the same time sworn in a gentleman of the bed-chamber, in spite of Somerset's opposition. The primate was called in upon this occasion to perform the office of catechist to the young knight, which he did by enjoining upon him three things, namely, to pray to God daily for grace to serve the king faithfully,—to do all good offices between his majesty and the queen and prince,—and to fill his sovereign's ears with nothing but the truth. James was pleased to pronounce the primate's advices "counsel fit for a bishop to give to a young man," and the catechumen promised to obey his reverend father's injunctions with all his strength and might. But the youth was destined to disappoint both the king and the archbishop.

Somerset early saw and marked the progress which his youthful rival was making in the king's favour, but he disdained to enter into any compromise with him. James is said to have directed Villiers to make overtures to Somerset; but the latter is reported to have repelled his advances with this "quick and short answer: 'I will none of your service, and you shall none of my favour. I will, if I can, break your neck; and of that be confident.'" The issue showed how greatly Somerset miscalculated his true policy when he hurled this contemptuous defiance at his rival. It is not improbable, as a contemporary writer suggests, that had he met Villiers' advances in a conciliatory spirit, "Overbury's death had still been raked up in his own ashes."¹ At all events Somerset's hostility proved no impediment in the way of his rival's advancement. In a short time—"a very short time for such a prodigious ascent," says Lord Clarendon,—he was made a baron, a viscount, an earl, a marquess; he became lord-high-admiral of England, lord warden of the cinque ports, master of the horse, and dispensed the royal patronage at will. His extravagance kept pace with his advancement. "It was common with him," says Oldys in his *Life of Raleigh*, "at an ordinary dancing to have his clothes trimmed with great diamond buttons, and to have diamond hat-bands, cockades, and ear-rings; to be yoked with great and manifold ropes and knots of pearl; in short, to be manacled, fettered, and imprisoned in jewels; insomuch, that at his going to Paris, in 1625, he had twenty-seven suits of clothes made, the richest that embroidery, lace, silk, velvet, gold, and gems, could contribute; one of which was a white uncut velvet, set all over, both suit and cloak, with diamonds, valued at £80,000, besides a great feather stuck all over with diamonds, as were also his sword, girdle, hat-band, and spurs." All this glitter and profusion was well-calculated to please the childish taste of the king, and to secure his favour, while it plunged him into fresh embarrassments to supply the enormous expenses of his idolized minion. Of course, every honour that it was in the power of the crown to bestow, and in the heart of Villiers to wish for, was conferred upon him with a readiness which almost anticipated his own inordinate ambition. In less than three years from his being admitted

¹ Weldon's *Court of King James*, p. 97.

into knighthood, he found himself marquess of Buckingham. Shortly after, his mother was created countess of Buckingham in her own right; his brothers were created barons, his sisters married to nobles, and the nation beheld with indignation many of the oldest and most faithful servants of the crown displaced to make room for the connexions and friends of the selfish and unprincipled upstart.

In 1620, Buckingham married the only daughter of the earl of Rutland, the richest heiress in the kingdom. Soon after this the king's declining state of health suggested to the marquess the policy of endeavouring to secure the affection of the young heir-apparent. Negotiations were at this moment going forward at the Spanish court for an alliance betwixt Charles and the infanta; the prince "loved adventures,"² and Buckingham resolved to gratify him with one which, if it succeeded as he anticipated, would have the effect of placing him high in the confidence and good will of the heir-apparent. He persuaded Charles to petition his father for permission to pay a personal visit to the court of Madrid, having first wrought upon the feelings of the romantic prince by setting before him the pleasures which would attend such an adventure. Through the joint importunity of both, a reluctant assent to the project was at last wrung from the king; and the prince and Buckingham set off together *incog*. They travelled through France, and after a variety of absurd adventures, arrived at Madrid, alone, on a Friday night, alighting at the house of Lord Bristol, "never merrier in their lives." D'Israeli describes "the romantic visit by which the prince had thrown himself into their arms, as electrifying the whole Spanish nation, and drawing all their hearts towards the hope of England." The truth is, the two companions were heartily laughed at in secret for their pains; their arrival had long been anticipated, and the Spanish ministry stood prepared to turn the whole affair to the best advantage long before the travellers presented themselves in Madrid. The ultimate failure of the negotiation, while it may be ascribed on the one hand to the preposterous demands of the Spanish council, must, on the other, be traced to Buckingham himself. In his anxiety to supplant the earl of Bristol—to whose management the whole negotiation had been already entrusted by James—he greatly offended that able minister, while "the airy freedom of his manners, after degenerating into the grossest licentiousness of conduct, was never to be forgiven by the offended majesty of Philip, and the contemptuous pride of Olivarez."³ At last the two adventurers resolved to return home. Buckingham set off alone, without taking a ceremonious leave of the court; but Charles was escorted in great style to the coast.

It would appear that Olivarez, through the agency of the Spanish ambassador at London, had nearly accomplished the fall of Buckingham after his return to England, but for the interference of the lord-keeper Williams, who succeeded in satisfying James that the duke had acted a proper part towards him and the prince. Buckingham was now utterly anti-Spanish and personally bent on war. He now began to practise the new part of a patriot, and paid court to the popular leaders in both houses. He urged the king to assemble parliament, and thereafter, in a convention at Whitehall, he proceeded to lay before them an account

² Clarendon.

³ D'Israeli

of his Spanish journey and of the prince's reception at Madrid. His relation was in all material respects false and inaccurate. He represented the court of Spain as having been insincere from first to last in the matter of the marriage-treaty; he alleged that the earl of Bristol had betrayed the interests of his sovereign and country; and he declared that Charles, after having sustained a variety of indignities at Madrid, had now abandoned all desire as well as hope of the proposed alliance. The prince, who stood by, corroborated this extraordinary statement, and both houses voted an address expressive of their judgment that the king of England could not in honour proceed in his negotiations with Spain. James responded by professing his readiness to go to war with Spain for the honour of the nation, and parliament eagerly embraced the proposal and volunteered three subsidies for the purpose. The duke was now for a time the most popular man in England. The declaration of war with Spain, which was justly attributed to his sole influence, was regarded as a great national deliverance from impending popery, and even the puritan party were for a time deceived by the specious pretences of the duke. But the arrival of Bristol served to disabuse the public of its mistake, and the zeal with which Buckingham had bent himself to a project of alliance with France, completely dispelled the temporary illusion which had prevailed regarding his abhorrence of popery.

In the first parliament of the new monarch, which met at Oxford in August 1625, Buckingham took upon himself the task of explaining the king's intentions, and reconciling the commons to the demand for a further subsidy. But he soon found that he had charged himself with a duty of no small difficulty and peril. In the house of lords, he was encountered by a formidable opposition under Pembroke; in the commons he was assailed by such men as Coke, Wentworth, and Fleetwood, who boldly charged him with peculation, with incapacity, with ambition; and proceeded at last to threaten him with impeachment,—a fate from which he was only rescued by Charles hastily dissolving the parliament under the pretext of avoiding the plague which had just made its appearance in Oxford.

After the sailing of the ill-fated expedition against Cadiz, Buckingham went to Holland, in company with Lord Kensington, taking with him the crown-plate and jewels, with the view of raising a loan on their security. He intended next to proceed to Paris, but had the mortification to receive a message from Richelieu informing him that his presence in that capital would not be tolerated. The cause of this disgrace was his presumptuous advances to the young Queen Anne of Austria, the elder sister of the Spanish infanta and consort of Louis. It is impossible to determine what encouragement Buckingham had received from Anne. Her female biographer is of opinion that the attachment was mutual. It is certain that Buckingham had the hardihood even after this repulse, to persevere in his attempts to obtain admission to the French court, but the indignation of Louis continued to oppose an insurmountable barrier to his wishes.

The measure of the duke's impeachment was again agitated in the new parliament. Bristol exhibited articles against Buckingham, in which he accused him of false practices at the court of Spain, and of having deceived both his sovereign and the parliament by falsehood

and misrepresentations at his return from that country. Charles, conscious of the disclosures which it was in the power of the earl of Bristol to make, had endeavoured to prevent disclosure by intimidation, and had even ventured to place the earl under restraint, the moment he arrived from Spain; but the lords resented this as an aggression on their order, and compelled the king to set Bristol at large. In the meanwhile, the commons also had impeached the favourite upon thirteen charges, of which the substance was that he had embezzled the revenue of the crown; that he had corruptly dealt in places and pensions; that he had allowed the trade of the country to decay through his negligence; that he had unjustly detained a French ship for his own profit; that he had procured a loan of ships to suppress the Protestants in France; that he had extorted £10,000 from the East India company; and that he had presumed to administer medicine to the late king without the approbation of the physicians. The charge was opened by Sir Dudley Digges, and conducted by six other members, among whom Sir John Elliot, having compared Buckingham to Sejanus in lust, rapacity, and ambition, concluded with these words: "My lords, you see the man. By him came all these evils; in him we find the cause; in him we expect the remedies." All these charges Hume is pleased to pronounce either frivolous or false; but he adduces no evidence in support of his assertion. Whatever Charles thought of them, he acted as if he were determined to heap honours on the duke's head in proportion as he became obnoxious to the nation. The impeachment was yet pending when the chancellorship of Cambridge became vacant, and a royal mandate was issued proposing Buckingham as successor to Suffolk in that office. The earl of Andover was put in nomination against him, but the duke carried his election by a majority of three. Soon after, Buckingham presented answers to the charges which had been exhibited against him. The commons announced their intention of replying; but the king hastily dissolved parliament, and thus for a season sheltered his favourite from the storm which, had he lived, must sooner or later have burst upon his devoted head.

In 1627, Buckingham appeared before Rochelle, with an armament of one hundred sail, and demanded admission within the harbour. The inhabitants demurred for a while, and in the meantime the English troops made an ill-conducted descent on the isle of Rhé. Nothing could have been worse planned than this expedition. Its only results were the disgrace of the English arms, and the additional embarrassment of the Rochellois, who, on the withdrawal of the English forces, were left in a more defenceless state than ever. To the duke, however, the praise is due of having conducted himself with great personal intrepidity in this expedition. He soon afterwards undertook a second expedition to Rochelle, and had proceeded to Portsmouth for the purpose of embarking, when his career was cut short by the hand of an assassin of the name of Felton, on the 23d of August 1628.

The particulars of this assassination are thus related by Sir Simond D'Ewes: "August the 23d, being Saturday, the duke having eaten his breakfast between eight and nine o'clock in the morning in one Mr Mason's house in Portsmouth, he was then hastening away to the king, who lay at Reswicke, about five miles distant, to have some speedy conference with him. Being come to the farther part of the entry leading

out of the parlour into the hall of the house, he had there some conference with Sir Thomas Frier, a colonel; and stooping down in taking his leave of him, John Felton, gentleman, having watched his opportunity, thrust a long knife, with a white hilt, he had secretly about him, with great strength and violence, into his breast, under his left pap, cutting the diaphragma and lungs, and piercing the very heart itself. The duke having received the stroke, and instantly clapping his right hand on his sword-hilt, cried out, 'God's wounds! the villain hath killed me.' Some report his last words otherwise, little differing for substance from these; and it might have been wished, that his end had not been so sudden, nor his last words mixed with so impious an expression. He was attended by many noblemen and ladies, yet none could see to prevent the stroke. His duchess and the countess of Anglesey (the wife of Christopher Villiers, earl of Anglesey, his younger brother) being in an upper room, and hearing a noise in the hall, into which they had carried the duke, ran presently into a gallery, that looked down into it, and there beholding the duke's blood gush out abundantly from his breast and nose, and mouth (with which his speech, after those first words, had been immediately stopped), they broke out into pitiful outcries, and raised great lamentation. He pulled out the knife himself; and being carried by his servants unto the table, that stood in the same hall, having struggled with death near upon a quarter of an hour, at length he gave up the ghost, about ten o'clock, and lay a long time after he was dead upon the table." The assassin declared that he had no associate, and that a sense of duty to his country had alone prompted him to inflict the fatal blow. Charles was desirous of having him put to the torture, but the judges declared that torture was not justifiable by the law of England.

Thus fell one of the most profligate, the most daring, and the most successful courtiers that ever swayed the heart of an English monarch. D'Israeli has made a strenuous attempt to whitewash his character; but, as might easily have been anticipated, he completely fails in his main object, and only proves him to have been a very fascinating villain. "The duke," says this apologist, "must have had qualities of a better nature to have secured the constancy of Charles's personal attachment."—"The duke, in confidential interviews with Gerbier, repeatedly declared his solemn resolution, in his last expedition, to be 'the first man who should set his foot upon the dyke before the Rochelle, there to die or do the work.'"—"The spirit of this favourite of two monarchs had never been dissolved in that corporeal voluptuousness which his habits indulged."—"Buckingham had lofty aspirations."—"The genius of the man was daring and magnificent."—Such is a specimen of the manner in which the ingenious author of the '*Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles I.*' has executed his task. We have plenty of high-sounding assertions, and well-pointed antitheses, but nothing in the shape of proof or reasoning. And the whole concludes with the following paragraph, in which the writer himself seems to abandon his idol to the fate from which he affects to snatch him. "The virtues of a man who cannot be deemed virtuous; the talents of a man who so frequently was mortified to discover their incompetence; and the resolutions of a man to acquire popularity who never was popular, are the paradoxical qualities which may instruct us in the very interest-

ing character of the favourite of Charles the First, who had in vain attempted to become the favourite of the world! Had Buckingham escaped from the knife of the assassin, he would most probably have preceded Stafford and Laud to the scaffold. He was not that spiritless and corrupt favourite who could have crept into obscurity."⁴

Charles I.

BORN A. D. 1600.—DIED A. D. 1649.

CHARLES, the second son of James I. of England, and Anne of Denmark, ascended the throne in his 25th year.

The first object which engrossed the attention of the new king was his marriage with Henrietta of France. On the third day after the decease of his father, he ratified the treaty to which he had formerly subscribed, and appointed the duke of Chevreuse to act as his proxy at Paris, whither the duke of Buckingham hastened with a magnificent retinue to bring home the royal bride. At Dover, the queen was received by Charles and the English nobility, and the contract of marriage having been renewed at Canterbury, the royal couple proceeded to Hampton palace.

The day after their majesties' arrival, Charles met his first parliament. Hume informs us that the king's discourse to the parliament, on this occasion, 'was full of simplicity and cordiality;' that he lightly mentioned the occasion which he had for supply; that he employed no intrigue to influence the suffrages of the members; that he would not even allow the officers of the crown, who had seats in the house, to mention any particular sum which might be expected by him; that, secure of the affections of the commons, he was resolved that their bounty should be entirely their own deed,—unasked, unsolicited,—the genuine fruits of sincere confidence and regard. All this is very artfully said by the apologetical historian; but one is naturally led to ask at this stage of Charles's history what he had done to authorise him to reckon so securely on the 'confidence and regard' of his faithful commons. He had already adopted his father's detested favourite as his own bosom-friend, and was known to have his mind completely under Buckingham's influence; he had used the very first hours of his sovereignty to make a catholic princess a sharer of his throne, in despite of the expressed wishes of the nation; he knew also that the condition under which the last subsidies had been granted, namely, that their outlay should be controlled by parliamentary commissioners, had never been complied with; and, in the knowledge of this fact, he came forward and solicited another subsidy, without once adverting to the appointment of commissioners; moreover, he had hastily called together this parliament, at a time when a fearful plague was devastating London, and consequently, under circumstances which rendered protracted discussion impracticable, and plainly indicated his wish to avoid any thing like discussion upon the question of subsidies. Surely, in all this, there was little to win either 'sincere confidence' or 'regard.'

⁴ Commentaries, vol. II p. 178.

The commons granted two subsidies, amounting together to £112,000. This was liberal enough, considering their experience of the past, and the fact that no commissioners yet existed to control the expenditure of the national supplies. It was insufficient, however, for Charles's wants; and the parliament met again, after a short recess at Oxford. We have already, in our introductory sketch, adverted to Charles's disgraceful conduct in endeavouring to aid the French king against his protestant subjects at Rochelle. But, besides this infamous transaction, Charles had contrived, before the re-assembling of parliament to furnish his subjects with fresh grounds of suspicion and complaint, in his refusal to dismiss one of his chaplains, Montague, who had written a book in which, besides indulging in the most furious invective against the puritan party, he had become an apologist for the church of Rome, and evidently aimed at recommending a reunion betwixt the churches of Rome and England. Hume and Lingard affect to sneer at the bigotry which prompted Charles's commons to find fault with Montague's book and admire the king's complaisance in returning a gracious answer to the remonstrance of his parliament. Of course, these historians would equally admire the conduct of Charles, in soon after bestowing a bishopric upon Montague. They are perpetually enlarging upon the fanaticism of the times, as if that were the source of all the king's and all the nation's misfortunes, and as if the times of Charles formed the most illiberal epoch of English history. They evidently overlook the mighty difference which exists between the relative state of popery and protestantism in the days of puritanism and in our own. Popery was not then as it now is, a politically innoxious thing. The transactions of St Bartholomew's day, the wars of the League, the fires of Smithfield, the armada of Spain, the gunpowder treason, were then events but of yesterday; while an exterminating war was at the moment actually raging against protestantism in France. When we add to this that a bigotted catholic princess already shared the throne of England,—a priest, more than half-papist, exercised the primacy,—a nuncio from the pope resided in England,—and men of popish persuasion and feelings sat at the council board of the nation, need we wonder to hear of 'complaints against popery,' and 'suspicions of popish faction?' Unquestionably, there was a good deal of religious zeal at work throughout the country, but never did that powerful and noble principle exert itself with more uniform respect to the rights of conscience and the liberties of mankind.

"It was not," Lingard justly remarks, "the character of the king to be diverted from his purpose by opposition." He was bent on war with Spain, and to gratify his wishes in this respect he now had recourse to a forced loan. Among other illegal means resorted to, the duties on merchandise were levied, though the bill had not passed the house of lords. But if these measures disgusted the nation, the management and result of the expedition was not less unfavourable to Charles's popularity. It was placed under the command of Sir Edward Cecil, now created Lord Wimbledon, an officer whom the public voice pronounced unfit for the charge. It reached its first destination, Cadiz, but it neither succeeded in taking that city, nor in intercepting a rich convoy of Spanish merchantmen from the West Indies, which passed unobserved during the night.

Charles had now to face another parliament, from which he had still less reason than ever to expect a favourable reception. With the infatuation which ever marked his proceedings, he made preparations for meeting his commons by forcing the earl of Pembroke to an affected reconciliation with Buckingham,—taking the seals from the lord-keeper, Williams, whose opposition to the duties bill had offended him, and bestowing them upon Sir Thomas Coventry,—and endeavouring to withdraw the more efficient members of the opposition from the house of commons, by pricking them sheriffs of counties. The members thus distinguished were seven in number, namely, Sir Edward Coke, Sir Thomas Wentworth, Sir Francis Seymour, Sir Robert Philips, Sir Grey Palmer, Sir William Fleetwood, and Edward Alford. Of these Coke alone availed himself of the suggestion of their party that, though as sheriffs they could not be returned for places within their respective shires, yet they might sit as the representatives of other counties or boroughs.

Nothing could be more erroneous than Charles's notions of the nature and privileges of the English parliament. He desired the house "to remember that parliaments were altogether in his power, for their calling, sitting, and dissolution, and therefore, as he found the fruits of them good or evil, they were to continue or not to be." He did not hesitate to rebuke his commons for daring to "meddle with matters far above their reach and capacity." And he asserted, in opposition to the protest of the commons, that he was "free and able to punish any man's misdemeanours in parliament, as well during their sitting as after." But, preposterous as these notions were, Charles had not been left to form them wholly for himself. We have already seen his father advance his claim to absolute authority. His own chaplains were perpetually prating about the *jus divinum* of kings. Dr Sibthorpe hesitated not to say, "that if princes command any thing which subjects may not perform, because it is against the laws of God, or of nature, or impossible, yet subjects are bound to undergo the punishment without either resisting or reviling, and to yield a passive obedience where they cannot exhibit an active one." Dr Mainwaring went a step farther and said, "the king is not bound to observe the laws of the realm concerning the subjects' rights and liberties, but that his royal will and command, in imposing loans and taxes, without common consent in parliament, doth oblige the subjects' conscience, on pain of damnation!"

At Candlemas the king was crowned, and four days later he met the new parliament. Two things were remarked on this occasion. When the people were called upon to testify, by their general acclamation, their consent to have Charles for their sovereign, they remained silent till the earl-marshal desired them to shout; and the anointing was performed behind a traverse by Archbishop Abbot, so that it was not witnessed by the assembly.¹ It is also said that an attempt was made by Laud, then bishop of Bath and Wells, and officiating as dean of Westminster, to alter the form of engagement pronounced by the king. The phrase *quas vulgus elegerit leges*, was supplied by another which hinted at a dispensing power in the crown, *salvo prerogativo regali*. The commons voted three subsidies at their new meeting, but declined to give their

¹ D'Ewes Letter in Ellis, iii. 214.

vote the efficacy of a law until their grievances were taken into consideration by the king and council. Charles resented this by threats, and talked of trying 'new counsels,'—language, the full import of which the vice-chamberlain, Sir Dudley Carleton, besought the house warily to consider before they drew upon themselves all that was implied in it. Meanwhile, Charles, bent upon his own ruin, placed himself in direct collision with both houses of parliament. He imprisoned the earls of Arundel and Bristol, and likewise Digges and Elliot, members of the lower house, the leaders in the now revived impeachment of Buckingham. To the embarrassments in which Charles's determined defence of his minion involved him, were soon added a succession of domestic quarrels with his young queen. "The king complained of the caprice and petulance of his wife; the queen of the morose and anti-gallican disposition of her husband. He attributed their disagreement to the discontent of her French attendants; she and her relations to the interested suggestions of Buckingham."² The dismissal of the whole French household of the queen followed.³ This act was resented as a great indignity by Louis; but the ambassador extraordinary, Bassompierre, at last patched up terms of reconciliation betwixt both courts, and betwixt Charles and his consort. A new establishment was formed partly of French, partly of English servants; and a bishop, a confessor, and ten priests were allowed to Henrietta, who thenceforward exerted a great and pernicious influence over her husband's councils. In 1628, Charles, urged by his pecuniary necessities, again ventured to assemble parliament. This led to the celebrated petition of right, to which we have largely adverted in our introductory sketch.

The assassination of his favourite, Buckingham, was a source of sincere and profound grief to Charles. He immediately took the duke's widow and children under his own protection; he paid his debts, amounting to £61,000; he styled him the martyr of his sovereign; and ordered his remains to be deposited in Westminster abbey. The death of Buckingham made way for Laud, who now gained an ascendancy in his sovereign's counsels, which was destined to prove as fatal to the interests both of sovereign and people as that which had been hitherto exercised by Villiers. The new counsellor soon plunged his master into a new train of difficulties by his intolerant and unjustifiable proceedings against dissenters; and by the ample grounds which his conduct afforded for suspecting him and Charles of a design to introduce popish tenets and ceremonies into the national church.

In 1633, Charles, in imitation of his father, resolved to pay a personal visit to his Scottish dominions. Accompanied by a gallant train of nobility, he arrived in Edinburgh on the 12th of June, that year, and was crowned king of Scotland by the archbishop of St Andrews on the 18th of the same month. On the 20th, he opened the Scottish parliament, which, after some opposition, passed an act which gave him the

² Lingard, vol. vi. p. 460.

³ The following is the letter from the king to the duke of Buckingham, for the final driving away of the Monsieus:—

"Steenie, I have received your letter by Dic Græme. This is my answer. I command you to send all the French away to-morrow out of the toune, if you can, by fair means, (but stike not long in disputing,) otherwise force them away lyke so many wyld beastes, until ye have shipped them—and so the devill goe with them! Lete me here no answer but of the performance of my command."

power of regulating the habits of the clergy. Lord Balmerino, for having in his possession a copy of a petition against this and other obnoxious acts, was tried and condemned by a packed jury; but apprehension of a popular tumult compelled the king to spare his life.⁴ Charles next proceeded to introduce a new liturgy, similar to that of the church of England, but approximating still nearer to the catholic forms. This last measure, one of Charles's apologists allows, was 'very ill-timed.' It was resisted by the whole population of the country, and led to the famous solemn league and covenant which was now drawn up and signed by more than thirty peers, and a great majority of the gentry of Scotland. Nothing could be more weak and more deceitful than Charles's whole conduct towards his Scottish subjects at this time. He first attempted to terrify the malcontents into silence, and then sent the marquess of Hamilton to negotiate with the leaders of the covenant until his preparations for introducing an army into Scotland could be completed. Several of Charles's letters to Hamilton are still extant,⁵ in which he instructs the commissioner to flatter the covenanters with what hopes he pleases, until the royal fleet should have set sail. Yet Hume will represent Charles as one of the most 'candid, sincere, and upright' of men. The king's preparations were slow, and Hamilton endeavoured to amuse the Scots a little longer with a sham covenant, which was indignantly rejected by the nation. He then attempted to dissolve the general assembly, which had been convoked by his own orders, but was proving less manageable than he could have wished; but the assembly maintained its own right of sitting, and proceeded to abolish episcopacy of its own authority. Hamilton was succeeded by Traquair as commissioner, for Charles found himself wholly unable to subdue his Scottish subjects by force of arms. Traquair prorogued the parliament, which obeyed the order, but protested against it, and sent commissioners to London for that purpose. Charles immediately threw the Scottish deputies into prison, and put his army in motion; but the Scots passed the Tweed, routed Lord Conway at Newburn on the Tyne, and took Newcastle. The humbled monarch was now compelled to negotiate with his Scottish subjects.

The proceedings of the long parliament have been already related in our introductory sketch. The impeachment and execution of Strafford, which forms another important chapter in Charles's life, will be related in our sketch of that minister. After the passing of the bill, declaring parliament indissoluble except by its own consent, and the bills for the abolition of the star-chamber and high-commission courts, the Scots returned to their homes, Charles having previously disbanded the Irish army which he had raised for the purpose of invading Scotland. Hume is pleased to represent Charles as now determining to revisit Scotland "with an intention of abdicating almost entirely the small share of power which there remained to him, and of giving full satisfaction, if possible, to his restless subjects in that kingdom." All this sounds well, but is founded only on the historian's knowledge of what was in Charles's heart at the time. It is true, indeed, that he did make some concessions to his Scottish subjects on this occasion; he appointed Henderson his head-chaplain; he divided the revenues of

⁴ Howel's State Trials, vol. iii. p. 591—712.

⁵ See Burnet's Memoirs of the Hamiltons.

the dissolved bishoprics among the leading noblemen ; he even surrendered his prerogative of appointing the chief officers of state. But "the king's great object in making these concessions was to obtain security for his friends, whom, under the name of incendiaries, he had been compelled to abandon to the mercy of the estates, and who were threatened by their countrymen with the fate of the earl of Strafford."⁶ And the discovery of the 'incident,' as it was called, being a plot to seize if not assassinate the most distinguished of the popular leaders in Scotland, stamps the whole of Charles's transactions in Scotland with the characters of falsehood and treachery.

Charles was now hastening with the precipitation of a maniac to his own destruction. He had no sooner got back to his English capital than he issued a proclamation requiring conformity to the established church, and surrounded himself with a number of discharged officers and soldiers, as a kind of body-guard, under the command of one Lunsford who was actually under outlawry for an attempt at assassination. The protestation of the bishops, and the impeachment of Kimbolton and the five members, were acts still more fatal to the infatuated monarch.

Even after the decisive defeat of Naseby, Charles might yet have retraced his steps, and saved both his crown and his life. But he intrigued with Ormonde, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and concluded a secret treaty by which the Irish agreed to pour an army of 20,000 men into Scotland ; he intrigued with the Scottish commissioners, Lanerie and Lauderdale, promising to establish presbytery for three years and to extirpate the independents ; and in the height of his infatuation, he rejected with circumstances of insult, the overtures of the independent leaders. At last his double dealings were discovered, and nothing remained for him but flight. His scheme for this purpose was ill-devised ; in a few days he was lodged a prisoner in Carisbrook castle in the isle of Wight. Even here he recommenced his former intrigues, and held secret interviews with the Scots commissioners while he endeavoured to effect a personal treaty with the parliament. The houses demanded the royal assent to four bills which they had prepared, as the only condition on which they would consent to a personal treaty. The first of these bills, after vesting the command of the army in the parliament for twenty years, enacted, that after that period, whenever the lords and commons should declare the safety of the kingdom to be concerned, all bills passed by them respecting the forces, by sea or land, should be deemed acts of parliament, even though the king for the time should refuse his assent. The second declared all oaths, proclamations, and proceedings against the parliament during the war, void and of no effect. The third annulled all titles of honour granted since the 20th of May, 1642, and deprived all peers to be created thereafter of the right of sitting in parliament, without the consent of the two houses ; and the fourth gave to the houses the power of adjourning from place to place at their discretion.⁷ Charles, it is probable, would have assented to these bills, had not the Scots commissioners encouraged him to hold out. The answer which he returned was, that nothing would induce him to assent to any bills as a part of the agreement before the whole was concluded. On the

⁶ Lingard.

⁷ Lingard, vol. vi. p. 595.

evening of the same day in which he transmitted this message to London, Charles made an abortive attempt to escape from Carisbrook. The vigilance of Hammond, the governor, frustrated the attempt.

The Scottish clergy had expected Charles to subscribe the covenant when secretly presented to him at Carisbrook; the report of their commissioners undeceived them, and the nation no longer regarded the invasion of England with the same feelings with which they had at first entertained the proposal to take up arms for a covenanting king. It had been agreed that the entrance of the Scots into England should be the signal for a simultaneous rising of the royalists in every quarter of the kingdom. The impatience of the latter would not allow them to wait for the arrival of the Scots. The king's standard was raised at Pembroke, and partial risings took place at Chepstow, Norwich, Canterbury, Maidstone and Exeter; but the vigilance of Fairfax soon suppressed these movements; and the defeat of the Scottish army under Hamilton, at Preston, crushed the last hopes of Charles.

The army, flushed with victory, now listened with a ready ear to the hints which were thrown out by several of the leaders of bringing the king to trial. Among these last, Ludlow and Ireton were conspicuous. On the 29th of November, the king's person was seized by a military detachment under Rolfe, a major in the army, and he was removed to Hurst castle. A violent and long-protracted debate ensued in the house of commons, which issued in a resolution being carried by a majority of 46, that Charles had made such concessions as furnished sufficient ground for the future settlement of the kingdom. The army again interfered, and in the most unjustifiable manner seized on the persons of the most distinguished presbyterian leaders and committed them to different places of confinement. The day after the exclusion of the presbyterian members, Cromwell arrived from Scotland, and expressed his full concurrence in the measures which were now pursuing by the army. On the 23d of December, a resolution was passed in the commons to proceed against the king, and on the 1st of January 1649, a high-court of justice was appointed to try the question whether Charles Stuart, king of England, had or had not been guilty of treason in levying war against the parliament and kingdom of England. On the 20th of the same month the commissioners proceeded with the trial in Westminster hall. They were sixty-six in number, and John Bradshaw, sergeant-at-law, sat as president. Charles conducted himself during the trial with great composure and dignity. On the third day the court pronounced judgment of death against him. He heard the sentence unmoved, and made an attempt to address the court after it was pronounced, but Bradshaw ordered him to be removed, and he was hurried out of the hall by the guards. On the 30th of January, the sentence was carried into execution. We shall avail ourselves of Dr Lingard's account of the closing scene of the unfortunate monarch's life:

"In the meanwhile Charles enjoyed the consolation of learning that his son had not forgotten him in his distress. By the indulgence of Colonel Tomlinson, Seymour was admitted, delivered the letter, and received the royal instructions for the prince. He was hardly gone, when Hacker arrived with the fatal summons. The king proceeded through the long gallery, lined on each side with soldiers, who, far from

insulting the fallen monarch, appeared by their sorrowful looks to sympathize with his fate. At the end an aperture had been made in the wall, through which he stepped at once upon the scaffold. It was hung with black: at the further end were seen the two executioners, the block and the axe: below appeared in arms several regiments of horse and foot: and beyond, as far as the eye was permitted to reach, waved a dense and countless crowd of spectators. The king stood collected and undismayed amidst the apparatus of death. There was in his countenance that cheerful intrepidity, in his demeanour that dignified calmness, which had characterized, in the hall of Fotheringay, his royal grandmother, Mary Stuart. It was his wish to address the people, but they were kept beyond the reach of his voice by the swords of the military; and therefore confining his discourse to a few persons standing with him on the scaffold, he took, he said, the opportunity of denying in the presence of God, the crimes of which he had been accused. It was not to him, but to the houses of parliament, that the war and all its evils should be charged. The parliament had first invaded the rights of the crown by claiming the command of the army, it had provoked hostilities by issuing commissions for the levy of forces, before he had raised a single man. But he had forgiven all, even those, whoever they were, (for he did not desire to know their names,) who had brought him to his death. He did more than forgive them, he prayed that they might repent. But for that purpose they must do three things: they must render to God his due, by settling the church according to the scripture; they must restore to the crown those rights which belong to it by law; and they must teach the people the distinction betwixt the sovereign and the subject; those persons could not be governors who were to be governed,—*they* could not rule, whose duty it was to obey. Then, in allusion to the offers formerly made to him by the army; he concluded with these words; "Sirs, it was for the liberties of the people that I am come here. If I would have assented to any arbitrary sway, to have all things changed according to the power of the sword, I needed not to have come hither; and therefore I tell you, (and I pray God it be not laid to your charge,) that I am the martyr of the people."

Having added, at the suggestion of Dr Juxon, "I die a Christian according to the profession of the Church of England, as I found it left by my father," he said, addressing himself to the prelate, "I have on my side a good cause, and a gracious God."

Bishop.—There is but one stage more; it is a turbulent and troublesome, but a short one. It will carry you from earth to heaven, and there you will find joy and comfort.

King.—I go from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown.

Bishop.—You exchange an earthly for an eternal crown,—a good exchange.

Being ready, he bent his neck on the block, and after a short pause stretched out his hand as a signal. At that instant the axe descended; the head rolled from the body; a deep groan burst from the multitude of the spectators. But they had no leisure to testify their feeling: two troops of horse dispersed them in different directions."

We have already had an opportunity of expressing our sentiments with regard to the execution of Charles. The following are Mr Fox's observations on this transaction:—

“The execution of the king, though a far less violent measure than that of Lord Strafford, is an event of so singular a nature, that we cannot wonder that it should have excited more sensation than any other in the annals of England. This exemplary act of substantial justice, as it has been called by some, of enormous wickedness by others, must be considered in two points of view. First, was it not in itself just and necessary? Secondly, was the example of it likely to be salutary or pernicious? In regard to the first of these questions, Mr Hume, not perhaps intentionally, makes the best justification of it, by saying, that while Charles lived, the projected republic could never be secure. But to justify taking away the life of an individual, upon the principle of self-defence, the danger must be not problematical and remote, but evident and immediate. The danger in this instance was not of such a nature; and the imprisonment, or even banishment, of Charles, might have given to the republic such a degree of security as any government ought to be content with. It must be confessed, however, on the other side, that if the republican government had suffered the king to escape, it would have been an act of justice and generosity wholly unexampled; and to have granted him even his life, would have been one among the more rare efforts of virtue. The short interval between the deposal and death of princes is become proverbial; and though there may be some few examples on the other side, as far as life is concerned, I doubt whether a single instance can be found, where liberty has been granted to a deposed monarch. Among the modes of destroying persons in such a situation, there can be little doubt but that adopted by Cromwell and his adherents is the least dishonourable. Edward the Second, Richard the Second, Henry the Sixth, Edward the Fifth, had none of them long survived their deposal; but this was the first instance, in our history at least, where, of such an act, it could be truly said, that it was not done in a corner.

“As to the second question, whether the advantage to be derived from the example was such as to justify an act of such violence, it appears to me to be a complete solution of it to observe, that with respect to England, (and I know not upon what ground we are to set examples for other nations, or, in other words, to take the criminal justice of the world into our hands,) it was wholly needless, and therefore unjustifiable, to set one for kings, at a time when it was intended the office of king should be abolished, and consequently, that no person should be in the situation to make it the rule of his conduct. Besides, the miseries attendant upon a deposed monarch, seem to be sufficient to deter any prince, who thinks of consequences, from running the risk of being placed in such a situation; or, if death be the only evil that can deter him, the fate of former tyrants deposed by their subjects, would by no means encourage him to hope he could avoid even that catastrophe. As far as we can judge from the event, the example was certainly not very effectual, since both the sons of Charles, though having their father's fate before their eyes, yet feared not to violate the liberties of the people even more than he had attempted to do.

“If we consider this question of example in a more extended view, and look to the general effect produced upon the minds of men, it cannot be doubted but the opportunity thus given to Charles, to display his firmness and piety, has created more respect for his memory

than it could otherwise have obtained. Respect and pity for the sufferer, on one hand, and hatred to his enemies, on the other, soon produce favour and aversion to their respective causes; and thus, even though it should be admitted, (which is doubtful), that some advantage may have been gained to the cause of liberty, by the terror of the example operating upon the minds of princes, such advantage is far outweighed by the zeal which admiration for virtue, and pity for sufferings, the best passions of the human heart, have excited in favour of the royal cause. It has been thought dangerous to the morals of mankind, even in fiction and romance, to make us sympathize with characters whose general conduct is blameable; but how much greater must the effect be, when in real history our feelings are interested in favour of a monarch with whom, to say the least, his subjects were obliged to contend in arms for their liberty? After all, however, notwithstanding what the more reasonable part of mankind may think upon this question, it is much to be doubted whether this singular proceeding has not, as much as any other circumstance, served to raise the character of the English nation in the opinion of Europe in general. He who has read, and still more he who has heard in conversation, discussions upon this subject, by foreigners, must have perceived, that, even in the minds of those who condemn the act, the impression made by it has been far more that of respect and admiration, than that of disgust and horror. The truth is, that the guilt of the action, that is to say, the taking away the life of the king, is what most men in the place of Cromwell and his associates would have incurred; what there is of splendour and of magnanimity in it, I mean the publicity and solemnity of the act, is what few would be capable of displaying. It is a degrading fact to human nature, that even the sending away of the duke of Gloucester was an instance of generosity almost unexampled in the history of transactions of this nature."

Sir Dudley Carleton.

BORN A. D. 1573.—DIED A. D. 1631.

DUDLEY CARLETON, Lord Dorchester, was the eldest son of Anthony Carleton, of Baldwin-Brightwell, in the county of Oxford. He was born at his father's seat on the 10th of March, 1573. He received his education at Westminster school, and at Oxford.

In the year 1600, we find him appointed secretary to Sir Thomas Parry, our ambassador in France. In James's first parliament, he represented the borough of St Mawes, in Cornwall, and was considered an active member and good speaker. In 1605, he accompanied Norris into Spain, but in the latter end of that year he was recalled to England, and underwent a severe examination on suspicion of being concerned in the gun-powder plot. He succeeded in clearing himself of the charge, but seems to have remained a considerable time without further official employment. In 1610, he was nominated to the embassy at Venice, and before setting out received the honour of knighthood. In 1616, he was sent to the States-general of Holland, and was the last English minister who sat in the council of state of the United

Provinces, agreeably to the arrangement made with Elizabeth when she undertook the protection of the provinces. This appointment was one of peculiar difficulty, but Sir Dudley appears to have acquitted himself in it with considerable diplomatic ability. He was "equally careful," says Lloyd, "that the United Provinces should not be over-run by the armies of Spain, and that they should not be swallowed up by the protection of France. Watchful was his eye there," continues Lloyd, "over the West India company. Diligent his carriage upon any accommodations from Spain. Sincere his services to the prince-elect and his lady. Exact his rules of traffique and commerce, and dextrous his arts of keeping the States from new alliances, notwithstanding our likely marriage-treaty with Spain, especially since the prince of Orange bluntly, after his manner, *Qui at' il vostre marriage?* And indeed he behaved himself in all employments so well becoming a man that understood so many languages,—that was so well versed in ancient and modern history,—that had composed so many choice pieces of politicks,—that was so well seen in the most practical mathematicks,—and added to these a graceful and charming look, a gentle and a sweet elocution,—that, notwithstanding his and his brother Bishop Carleton's rigidnesse in some points, kept him to his dying day in great favour and most eminent service, and failing in nothing but his French embassy because there he had to do with women." The embassy here so quaintly referred to was that in which he acted in concert with Lord Holland, when the French court refused to receive Buckingham in the quality of ambassador. Its object was to mediate a peace between Louis and his protestant subjects, and to obtain the accession of the French monarch to the treaty of the Hague. On his return he found the commons threatening Buckingham with impeachment and interfered to moderate their proceedings. He failed to satisfy the popular party, but Charles rewarded his exertions in behalf of the favourite by calling him to the house of peers under the title of Baron Carleton of Imbercourt in Surrey.

In 1628, Charles bestowed an additional mark of favour upon him by creating him Viscount Dorchester. He now attached himself closely to Buckingham, and gave his undeviating support to all the measures of the duke until his assassination at Portsmouth. In 1631, he was appointed joint-secretary of state with Sir John Cooke. Lloyd informs us that soon after this he gave great offence to the commons by proposing an excise tax, and that "he hardly escaped being committed to the Tower" for his boldness. He died in February 1631. Having no heirs, the title became extinct, but it was revived in 1786, in the person of Sir Guy Carleton.

Carleton's abilities were by no means of the first order; but he was a painstaking man, and well acquainted with foreign affairs, to which he had the prudence to confine his attention almost exclusively. King Charles used to say, "that he had two secretaries of state, the lords Dorchester and Falkland, one of whom was a dull man in comparison with the other, and yet pleased him the best, for he always brought him his own thoughts in his own words,—the latter clothed them in so fine address that he did not always know them again."¹ Sir Dudley's

¹ Warwick's Memoirs.

letters during his Dutch embassy were edited and published by the earl of Hardwicke in 1757, in one volume 4to. Various letters in the 'Cabala' are attributed to him; and several in Sir Ralph Winwood's Memorials. He also was the author of two or three political tracts which were published in French during his life-time.

Sir John Eliot.

DIED A. D. 1632.

THIS distinguished patriot was of Cornish family. On the accession of Charles I. he was vice-admiral of Devonshire and member for Cornwall. In the agitations which almost immediately ensued, Sir John distinguished himself by his staunch adherence to the country party, and his vigorous defence of constitutional principles against the unwarrantable encroachments of Charles and his minister, Buckingham. His talents and eloquence, united to a character of fearless intrepidity and high integrity, soon placed him at the head of his party, and pointed him out to the unprincipled monarch as one of the men from whom he had most to fear in carrying through his designs against the freedom of parliament and the liberties of the subject. In the early part of the proceedings against Buckingham, Sir John took an active part, and was one of the first members of the lower house whom the king visited with his royal displeasure. Along with Sir Dudley Digges he was taken into custody, and conveyed to the Tower under a charge of treason; and at the beginning of Trinity term, 1629, was brought up by writ of *habeas corpus* to the king's bench, along with Selden, Stair, Holles, and others. The attorney-general proposed that bail should be taken, but this was refused unanimously by the prisoners, on the ground taken by Selden that it would be an acknowledgment of the legality of the commitment. With the others, Sir John was now condemned to imprisonment during the king's pleasure, and fined in £2,000. He said that "he had two cloaks, two suits, two pair of boots and gallashees, and a few books, and that was all his personal substance, and if they could pick up £2,000 out of that, much good might it do them." Soon after his commitment, symptoms of declining health appeared; and in October, 1631, his physicians reported that he "could never recover of his consumption, unless he might breathe purer air." Lord-chief-justice Richardson in reply observed, that "though Sir John was brought low in body, yet was he as high and lofty in mind as ever; for he would neither submit to the king nor the justice of that court." But the bench recommended Sir John to petition his majesty, which he did in these terms: "Sir, your judges have committed me to prison here, in your tower of London, where, by reason of the quality of the air, I am fallen into a dangerous disease. I humbly beseech your majesty, you will command your judges to set me at liberty, that, for recovery of my health, I may take some fresh air," &c. &c. To this application he received an answer, that the king did not consider it humble enough, whereupon he forwarded another petition couched in these terms: "Sir, I am heartily sorry I have displeased your majesty, and having so said, do humbly beseech you once again to set me at liberty, that, when

I have recovered my health, I may return back to my prison, there to undergo such punishment as God hath allotted unto me," &c. &c. This petition he sent to court by his son, but the lieutenant of the Tower thought such a proceeding highly informal, and that the application should have been made through him. On his expressing himself to this effect, Sir John said he would consider of it, but that his spirits were grown so 'feeble and faint,' that he felt himself unable to do any thing further for his deliverance at present. Not long after, this gallant patriot breathed his last in the Tower; he died on the 27th of November, 1632, the victim of the stern and unrelenting Charles. His son begged to be allowed to carry his body to Cornwall, there to be buried; but the unfeeling monarch immediately indorsed on the application, "Let Sir John Eliot's body be buried in the church of that parish where he died." The house of commons afterwards voted £5,000 to the martyred patriot's family.

D'Israeli has made a vigorous effort to blacken the memory of this illustrious man; he has even attempted to fasten upon him the charge of a cruel and treacherous attempt at murder, and represents him as only escaping condign punishment through the friendly mediation of Buckingham whose kindness he repaid by becoming his most bitter enemy.¹ The only authority for such grave charges is the unsupported testimony of Eachard. Lord Nugent has most triumphantly refuted the calumnious statement, and exposed the pertinacity in error which characterises the author of the 'Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles I.' He has shown from original documents that Mr Moyle of Bake, the person whom Sir John Eliot is accused of having "treacherously stabbed in the back," actually corresponded with Sir John afterwards in terms of friendship, and moreover did not disdain to solicit his favour and assistance. The origin of Eachard's story was this: Mr Moyle having acquainted Sir John Eliot's father with some extravagances in his son's expenses, and this being reported with some aggravating circumstances, young Eliot went hastily to Mr Moyle's house and remonstrated. What words passed is not known; but Eliot drew his sword and wounded Mr Moyle in the side. "On reflection," continues Mr Moyle's daughter, whose written statement of the transaction is still in existence, "he soon detested the fact; and, from thenceforward, became as remarkable for his private deportment, in every view of it, as his public conduct. Mr Moyle was so entirely reconciled to him, that no person in his time held him in higher esteem."²

During his imprisonment, Sir John employed himself in defending his views of civil government, in a treatise entitled 'The Monarchy of Man.' The manuscript of this work, consisting of 240 folio pages, is still preserved among the Harleian MSS. D'Israeli informs us that this work is ethical much more than political, and that it closes with the following eloquent passage on the independence of the mind. Having shown that man is excelled by other animals in many of his best faculties, he proceeds: "Man only was left naked, without strength or agility to preserve him from the danger of his enemies, multitudes exceeding him in either, many in both, to whom he stood obnoxious

¹ Commentaries, vol. ii. p. 268, *et seq.*

² Nugent's Memorials of Hampden, vol. i. p. 151, *et seq.*

and exposed, having no resistance, no avoidance for their furies; but in this case and necessity, to relieve him upon this oversight of Nature's Prometheus, that wise statesman, whom Pandora could not cozen, having the present apprehension of the danger, by his quick judgment and intelligence, secretly passed into heaven, steals out a fire from thence, infuses it into man, by that inflames his mind with a divine spirit and wisdom, and therein gives him full supply for all; for all the excellence of the creatures he had a far more excellence in this; this one was for them all, no strength, no agility could match it; all motions and abilities came short of this perfection; the most choice aims of Nature have their superlative in its acts; all the arts of Vulcan and Minerva have their comparative herein, in this divine fire and spirit, this supernatural influence of the mind, all excellence organical is surpassed; it is the transcendant of them all; nothing can come to match it, nothing can impeach it, but man therein is an absolute master of himself, his own safety and tranquillity by God, (for so we must remember the Ethics did express it,) are made dependant on himself, and in that self-dependence, in the neglect of others, in the entire rule and dominion of himself, the affections being composed, the actions so directed, is the perfection of our government, that *summum bonum* in philosophy, the *bonum publicum* in our policy, the true end and object of this Monarchy of Man."

Sir Edward Coke.

BORN A. D. 1550.—DIED A. D. 1634.

SIR EDWARD COKE, one of the most eminent of English lawyers, who successively filled the office of solicitor-general, attorney-general, and lord-chief-justice of the courts of common pleas and king's bench, was the son of Robert Coke, Esq., a bencher of Lincoln's inn, and was born at Mileham in the county of Norfolk, in the year 1550. His mother was Winifred, daughter and co-heiress of William Knightly, of Moregrave-Knightly in the same county. At the age of ten, Edward was sent to the free school of Norwich, whence he was removed to Trinity college, Cambridge, where he remained about four years. From Cambridge he was removed to Clifford's inn, and in the course of the next year he entered the Inner temple. After studying for six years—a short probation at that time—he was called to the bar, and held his first brief in the queen's bench, in Trinity term, 1578. About the same period he was appointed reader of Lyon's inn, where his lectures were much frequented. A few years after being called to the bar, he married Bridget, daughter and co-heiress of John Paston, Esq. of the county of Norfolk,—an alliance which brought him a large fortune and gave him considerable influence in his native county. He now rose rapidly into reputation and practice; he was chosen recorder of Coventry and of Norwich, and was frequently consulted by the lord-treasurer Burleigh; the free holders of Norfolk returned him as representative to parliament, and in the 35th of Elizabeth, he was chosen speaker of the house of commons. In 1592, he became solicitor-general, and was soon after advanced to the post of attorney-general.

Having lost his first wife, by whom he had ten children, he married the Lady Hatton, relict of Sir William Hatton, and sister of Lord Burleigh.

The most important case, in which, as attorney-general, Coke was engaged during the reign of Elizabeth, was the prosecution of the earls of Essex and Southampton, who, on the 19th of February 1600, were tried before their peers for high treason. In the conduct of this prosecution, the attorney-general bore himself with much harshness towards the prisoners. Speaking of Essex, he exclaimed, "Now in God's most just judgment he of his earldom shall be Robert the last, that of the kingdom thought to be Robert the first!" Essex indignantly answered him, "Will your lordships give us our turns to speak? for he playeth the orator, and abuseth our ears and us with slanders; but they are but fashions of orators in corrupt states." Southampton addressed him in these words, "Mr Attorney, you have urged the matter very far, and you wrong me therein—my blood be upon your head." But it was during the celebrated trial of Sir Walter Raleigh, which took place soon after the accession of James I., that Coke made the most intemperate display of himself. On this occasion he conducted himself with a degree of arrogance to the court, and of harshness and vindictiveness towards the prisoner, which was universally reprobated at the time, and has deeply stained a character presenting much to command our esteem.—"Your words cannot condemn me," said Raleigh, "my innocency is my defence. Prove one of those things wherewith you have charged me, and I will confess the whole indictment, and that I am the horriblemest traitor that ever lived, and worthy to be crucified with a thousand cruel torments."—"Nay," answered Coke, "I will prove all!—thou art a monster; thou hast an English face but a Spanish heart.—Now you must have money. Aremberg was no sooner in England, (I charge thee, Raleigh) but thou incitest Cobham to go unto him, and to deal with him for money, to bestow on discontented persons to raise rebellion in the kingdom."—"Let me answer for myself," said Raleigh,—"Thou shalt not!" was the fierce and brutal reply of Coke. When Lord Cecil, one of the commissioners, interposed and begged that he would permit the prisoner to speak, "Mr Attorney sate down in a chafe, and would speak no more, until the commissioners urged and entreated him, when, after much ado, he went on." Several years afterwards, when Sir Edward Coke, as chief-justice of the court of king's bench, passed sentence of death upon the unfortunate Raleigh, he conducted himself to the prisoner in a very different manner, and seemed desirous, however late, of making some reparation for his former conduct.

In the year 1606, Sir Edward, as attorney-general, conducted the prosecution of Sir Everard Digby and the other parties implicated in the gunpowder-plot. On this occasion he obtained great credit for the acuteness and sagacity with which he unravelled the intricacies of so obscure and complicated a case; but the harshness with which it seemed natural for him to exercise his official duties as public prosecutor, revealed itself in the bitterness of his invectives against the prisoners. On the 20th of June, 1606, Sir Edward Coke was promoted from the office of attorney-general to the chief-justiceship of the common pleas; Sir Henry Hobart succeeded him in the post of attorney-

general, and Sir Francis Bacon became the new solicitor-general,—an office to which he had long aspired, but which, as he imagined, he had been debarred from filling by the influence of Sir Edward Coke. To this feeling, whether just or not, may be traced the animosity which distinguished the intercourse of these two eminent men in after life. But whilst Bacon “prostrated one of the noblest intellects with which man was ever endowed” in the pursuit of the royal favour, Coke maintained the most unsullied integrity of judicial character. He opposed the arbitrary and unconstitutional proceedings of the high-commission court, and hesitated not to grant prohibitions, when moved for, against that court and the council of York and Wales, and afterwards to vindicate this bold line of conduct on the part of the judges of the common law, when summoned before his majesty in November, 1608. Four years afterwards, a vehement controversy ensued between Archbishop Abbot and Sir Edward, as to the power of the judges of the common pleas, which ultimately led to a resolution that the court of high-commission should be reformed. To the reformed commission Sir Edward objected that it contained many points contrary to the laws and statutes of England, and refused to sit under it. In 1612, Coke intimated his opinion against the legality of the proclamation, or edicts, which King James had been in the habit of issuing, and in which he assumed to himself the prerogatives of parliament. The opinion presented on this occasion by Sir Edward and his brother Justices bore “that the king by his proclamation cannot create any offence which was not an offence before, for then he may alter the law of the land by his proclamation in a high point; for if he may create an offence where none is, upon that ensues fine and imprisonment,” and “that the king hath no prerogative but that which the law of the land allows him.”

The discovery of the poisoning of Sir Thomas Overbury, in 1615, afforded another opportunity for the display of Sir Edward's professional tact and judicial integrity, and drew forth an encomium even from Bacon himself. The result of this ‘grand oyer of poisoning,’ was the conviction and execution of the prisoners, with the exception of the earl and countess of Somerset, who were pardoned, and even pensioned by the king. In 1616, the attorney-general was ordered to notify to the chief-justice, that a cause before the king's bench, in which certain positions had been laid down by the council, injurious to the royal prerogative, should proceed no farther until his majesty should have been consulted thereon. This proceeding Coke and his brother-judges declared to be contrary to law and their oaths; and, on being summoned to appear before the privy-council, Sir Edward shrunk not from affirming that the postponement required by the king was a delay of justice, and contrary to law and the judge's oaths. On the following question being propounded to each of the judges: “Whether if at any time, in a case depending before them, which his majesty conceived to concern him either in power or in profit, and thereupon required to consult with them, that they should stay proceeding in the mean time, they ought not to stay accordingly?” with the single exception of Sir Edward Coke, all the judges acknowledged that it was their duty so to do; but the reply of the lord-chief-justice was, “that when that case should be, he would do that should be fit for a judge to do.” The odium into

which, in all probability, this conduct brought the chief-justice at court, was farther increased by the dispute in which he involved himself with the lord-chancellor, Ellesmere, with regard to the authority of their respective courts. Bacon artfully fomented the contest, and incited the king to take part in it against Coke. On the 26th of July, 1616, he was cited before the privy-council and reprimanded for "certain acts and speeches wherewith his majesty was unsatisfied." On the 15th of November, in the same year, Sir Henry Montague was appointed chief justice, Coke having been previously deprived of his high judicial rank by a writ of *supersedeas*.

The marriage of Sir Edward's daughter to Sir John Villiers, the brother of the earl of Buckingham, facilitated the restoration of Coke to the royal favour. He had at a former period expressed himself averse to this alliance, but now saw reasons sufficient to induce him to give his consent to the match, which was likewise eagerly promoted by Secretary Winwood, betwixt whom and Sir Francis Bacon a coolness had arisen, and who saw in the restoration of the late chief-justice to power the surest means of humbling the lord-keeper. Bacon did what he could to prevent the match, but drew upon himself the severe censure of the king for his interference, and being soon after convicted of bribery, was disgraced. To the honour of Sir Edward Coke—who was one of the committee appointed to prepare the charges against the chancellor—he displayed great moderation and forbearance in his conduct towards his fallen enemy.

Although thus restored to favour, Sir Edward received no other appointment than that of privy-councillor. In 1620, he appeared in parliament as one of the representatives for the borough of Liskeard, in Cornwall. In this capacity he strenuously upheld the authority of parliament and the privileges of the commons; and he took so active a part in the question of privileges arising out of the case of Sir Edwin Sandys, that, on the 27th of December, 1621, he was committed to the Tower, and soon afterwards he was again dismissed from his place at the council-table. On the accession of Charles I., Coke took a conspicuous part in opposing the subsidies. To get rid of his opposition in the house of commons, he was nominated sheriff of Buckinghamshire, but, notwithstanding this appointment, he was returned as knight of the shire for Norfolk. In the third parliament of Charles I., Sir Edward appeared as one of the representatives for Buckinghamshire, and gave his assistance to the framing of the famous petition of right. Sir Robert Heath, the attorney-general, having, on the first discussion, treated some of Coke and Selden's precedents for the ancient liberties of England slightly, Coke replied, restating them, and declaring, in the full confidence of his powers and his cause, that "it was not under Mr Attorney's cap to answer any one of those arguments." He also boldly attacked the duke of Buckingham, whom he openly denounced as the cause of all the nation's misfortunes. On the dissolution of this parliament, in March, 1628, O. S., Sir Edward Coke retired from public life to his seat at Stoke-Pogis, where he spent the remainder of his life. He died on the 3d of September, 1634, and was buried at Titchshall church, in Norfolk. A short time previous to his death his house was searched by an order from the privy-council, for treasonable and seditious papers, and many of his valuable MSS. carried away.

"Sir Edward Coke," says a writer in the 'Retrospective review,' "has been emphatically and truly called, the oracle of the law, for his name alone confers an almost undisputed authority. His learning was at once profound, excursive, and curious. When he applied the powers of his strong mind to the illustration of a legal question, he wholly exhausted the subject, and rather than quit it he would resort even to remote analogies. With the grounds and reasons of the common law he was perfectly familiar, and, upon the whole, he may be considered the most consummate lawyer of his own or any other time. His works, the honourable monuments of his unconquerable industry—for they were composed in the precious intervals of a more than usually active professional life—have received from succeeding times those marks of distinction which are due to their merit. His Institutes and Reports are called *par excellence*, 'The Institutes' and 'The Reports,' and his first Institute, the Commentary upon Littleton, has become the bible of the law. In the course of his laborious researches, some inaccuracies and incongruities necessarily occur, more especially in the posthumous portions of his works. The incorruptible integrity which he displayed in his professional character is, even more than his learning, worthy of the highest praise. His preferment was always obtained, to use his own words, without either prayers or pence, and in an age more than usually corrupt, he avoided the general contamination."

William Noy.

BORN A. D. 1577.—DIED A. D. 1634.

THIS strenuous supporter of the royal prerogative was the son of William Noy of St Burian in Cornwall, gent. He was born there in 1577, and, at the age of sixteen, he became a student at Exeter college, Oxford. Here he continued about three years a severe student, and from thence proceeded to the study of the common law in Lincoln's inn, where he persevered with extraordinary diligence in that pursuit, and where he laid the foundation of his great reputation for a knowledge of old records and precedents.

Toward the close of the reign of James the First he was chosen to represent Helston, in his native county; and in two successive parliaments appeared as "a professed enemy to the king's prerogative."

In 1625, soon after the accession of Charles 1st, he was elected for St Ives, in Cornwall, and in this and the following parliament persevered in his opposition to the royal claims. Having thus distinguished himself on the side of popular rights, he was sent for by Charles, who told him that he would make him his attorney-general. Noy appeared at first indifferent to the proposed honour; but, after much solicitation, accepted the office, and, from that moment, commenced a course diametrically opposed to the former, and became the most able and determined advocate of the prerogative of the crown, advising and assisting the king, in his measures for raising money without consent of parliament. Clarendon remarks of him, that on this advancement, "the court made no impression upon his manners: upon his mind it did; and, though he wore about him an affected morosity, which made him unapt to flatter other

men, yet even that morosity and pride rendered him the most liable to be flattered himself that can be imagined. And by this means, the great persons who steered the public affairs, by admiring his parts and extolling his judgment, as well to his face as behind his back, wrought upon him by degrees, for the eminency of the service, to be an instrument in all their designs; thinking that he could not give a clearer testimony that his knowledge in the law was greater than all other men's, than by making that law which all other men believed not to be so. So he moulded, framed, and pursued the odious and crying project of soap; and with his own hand drew and prepared the writ for ship-money, both which will be the lasting monuments of his fame."

Noy was an indefatigable student and antiquary; and, being exhausted with severe application, went, in 1634, to Tunbridge wells, for the benefit of the waters; but, receiving no benefit from them, he sunk under his complaint—a disease of the heart—and died there on the 9th of August, in that year. His body was conveyed to New Brentford, in Middlesex, and buried there under the communion-table of the parish church.

The king, it is said, was much affected by the death of his attorney-general; and, on the news of his decease reaching Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, then at Hoydon, he inserted in his diary:—"I have lost a dear friend of him, and the church the greatest she had of his condition since she needed any such." The clergy in general sympathized with this prelate on their loss; but the people, in general, rejoiced. Lloyd, in his *State Worthies*, observes of Noy, that "he was very vigilant over the adversaries of the church. Witness his early foresight of the danger, and industrious prosecution of the illegality of the design of buying impropriations, set up by persons not well-affected to the constitution." He adds, that "he loved to hear Dr Preston preach, because he spake so solidly, as if he knew God's will."

Noy, however, was no friend to the puritans, but eagerly seized those occasions which his office admitted for visiting them with the penalties of the law. This appears in his prosecution of Prynne for a passage in his '*Histrio-mastix*,' which Laud and the bishops pretended was treasonable, or at least scandalous to the character of the queen, Henrietta, who had acted a part in a play at Somerset-house.

Noy's will created much surprise, from its singularity, and affords some idea of his peculiar manner. After bequeathing his son, Humphrey, a hundred marks per annum, he says, "the rest of all my lands, goods, &c., I leave to my son, Edward Noy, (whom I make my executor,) to be consumed and scattered about, *nec de eo melius speravi*, nor do I hope any better of him." But Edward, whatever effect so harsh a censure might have had upon him, lived only two years after his father, either to squander the estate or to reform, being killed in a duel in France, by one Captain Byron. Noy left many MSS. prepared for publication, and several of which were printed during the commonwealth.—1. '*A Treatise of the principal grounds and maxims of the laws of England*.' 1641.—2. '*Perfect Conveyancer, or several select and choice precedents*.' 1655.—3. '*Reports and cases in the time of Queen Elizabeth, King James, and King Charles I., containing the most excellent exceptions for all manner of declarations, pleadings, and demurs, exactly examined and laid down*.' 1656.—4. '*The Complete*

Lawyer ; or a treatise concerning tenures and estates in lands of inheritance for life and other hereditaments, and chattels, real and personal, &c.' 1661.—5. 'Arguments of law and speeches.'

He also left behind him several choice collections that he had made from the records in the Tower of London, reduced into two large paper books of his own hand-writing. One contained collections concerning the king's maintaining his naval power, according to the practice of his ancestors ; and the other about the privileges and jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts. To the latter collection, Dr Thomas James of Oxford, in the compilation of his 'Manuduction or Introduction unto Divinity,' printed in 1625, confesses himself indebted.

Sir Henry Wotton.

BORN A. D. 1568.—DIED A. D. 1639.

THIS celebrated statesman was the fourth son of Thomas Wotton, of Bocton-Malherb in Kent, and grandson of Sir Edward Wotton, privy-councillor, and treasurer of Calais, under Henry VIII. He was born in 1568, and received his early education at Winchester, whence he was removed to Oxford, where he entered as a gentleman-commoner of New-college in 1584, but soon after removed to Queen's college. While at Oxford, he distinguished himself by close application to his studies ; his proficiency in logic and philosophy was highly satisfactory to his tutors, but he peculiarly attached himself to the instructions of Albericus Gentilis, an Italian refugee of the protestant faith, who at this time filled the chair of jurisprudence at Oxford. This able man honoured young Wotton with his confidence, and assisted him in the attainment of Italian. He appears also to have occasionally sought relief from severer studies in the society of the muses, for we find him receiving the thanks of the society of Queen's college for the gratification which his tragedy of 'Tancredo' had afforded them.

In 1589 his father died, and he succeeded to a small annuity of one hundred marks. On this slender pittance he determined to set out on his travels ; and accordingly he appears to have spent several years in France, Germany, and Italy. He resided but one year in France ; the next three years he spent in Germany, chiefly at Ingolstadt and Vienna, where he passed for a German and a catholic. At Vienna he lodged with the emperor's librarian, and enjoyed an opportunity of inspecting numerous important manuscripts relating to the state of the empire. From Germany he passed into Italy, where he remained five years. His long residence in the latter country, though ostensibly devoted to the pursuit of literature and the fine arts, was doubtless connected with some purposes of a political nature, for we find him using many precautions to conceal his nation. In May, 1592, he thus writes to Lord Zouch from Florence, giving an account of his journey from Venice to Rome : " I had the company of the baron, with whom, notwithstanding the catholic religion, I entered into very intrinsical familiarity, having persuaded him that I was half his countryman, himself being born, though under the duke of Cleve, not far from Colen, which went for my town. I found him by conversation to be very indiscreet, soon

led, much given to women, careless of religion,—qualities notably serving my purpose; for while a man is held in exercise with his own vices, he hath little leisure to observe others; and besides, to feign myself an accommodable person to his humour in all points was indeed most convenient for me; looseness of behaviour, and a negligent worldly kind of carriage of a man's self, are the faults that States least fear, because they hurt only him in whom they are found. To take the benefit of this, I entered Rome with a mighty blue feather in a black hat: which, though itself were a slight matter, yet surely it did work in the imaginations of men three great effects: first, I was by it taken for no Englishman, upon which depended the ground of all; secondly, I was reputed as light in my mind as in my apparell (they are not dangerous men that are so); thirdly, no man could think that I desired to be unknown, who by wearing that feather, took a course to make myself famous through Rome in a few days."¹ With all his precautions, however, and blue feather to boot, a sagacious Scotchman was so near discovering his secret that he judged it prudent to withdraw from Rome. He now took up his abode at Sienna, where he remained some time. In 1595 he returned to England.

Wotton's accomplishments, learning, and knowledge of the world, soon recommended him to the earl of Essex, who appointed him one of his secretaries. On the ruin of his patron he made his escape to France, and thus escaped sharing the fate of his fellow-secretary, Henry Cuff, who was hanged for concealing his knowledge of his master's treasons. He soon turned his steps once more to Italy, and took up his residence in Florence, where he gained the esteem of the grand duke, Ferdinand, and where an incident occurred which was destined to introduce him to the acquaintance and favour of king James. Ferdinand had intercepted a despatch of great importance relative to an intrigue for assassinating the king of Scots; and being desirous to communicate the discovery to James, his secretary, Vietta, recommended Wotton as a fit messenger to employ in so delicate and hazardous a mission. Wotton at once undertook the task; and the more effectually to escape suspicion, he proceeded first to Norway, where he embarked for Scotland. On reaching Stirling he gained admission to the king under the assumed character of a Florentine; but, after delivering his despatch, he contrived to inform his majesty in a whisper that he was an Englishman in disguise, and solicited a private interview. This was granted, and Wotton spent above three months at the Scottish court, during all which time his real name and character were unknown to any one save James himself.

A few months after his return to Florence, the death of Elizabeth—whom he had vainly attempted to propitiate by the composition of a work entitled 'The State of Christendom,' in which he took care to represent her majesty's government as the model of perfection—and the accession of James, terminated his expatriation, and opened up his way to honour and offices. James received him with the utmost cordiality, declaring that "he was the most honest, and therefore the best dissembler he had ever met with;" he soon after knighted him, and next year offered him his choice of the embassies to France, to Spain, or to Ve-

¹ Walton's *Life of Wotton*.

nice. He preferred the last; and conducted himself so much to the king's satisfaction, that he was sent on two other occasions to Venice; he also performed embassies to the United Provinces, to the duke of Savoy, the united princes of Germany, the Archduke Leopold, the duke of Wirtemberg, the imperial cities of Strasburg and Ulm, and the emperor Ferdinand II. In all these missions Sir Henry exhibited great skill as a diplomatist. But he appears to have nearly forfeited his royal master's confidence by one little piece of imprudence, which we shall relate as characteristic of the times and of the temper of the English monarch. On his way to Venice, through Germany, Sir Henry happened to spend some days at Augsburg, where he met with some ingenious and learned men, one of them requested him to write some sentence in his album as a memorandum of him. With this request Sir Henry good-humouredly complied, and, taking occasion from some incidental discourse of the company, inserted the following definition of an ambassador in his friend's album: "*Legatus est vir bonus peregre missus ad mentiendum reipublicæ causâ;*" that is, "An ambassador is an honest man sent abroad to tell falsehoods for the good of his country." By some unlucky chance, eight years afterwards, this album fell into the hands of the scurrilous Jasper Scioppius, who was at that time engaged in writing a book against King James. Wotton's sentence caught his eye, and he immediately introduced it into his book as an authentic specimen of the principles which this protestant monarch inculcated upon his servants. James was greatly grieved at this, and for a time threatened to visit his imprudent ambassador with some signal mark of his displeasure. But an apologetical letter, '*De Caspare Scioppio,*' which Sir Henry addressed to James, so mightily pleased the royal pedant that he declared publicly "he had commuted sufficiently for a greater offence."

Wotton returned to England the year before king James died. He now withdrew from politics, and accepted, in 1623, the provostship of Eton college. In this comparative retreat he gave himself up entirely to religious meditation and the tranquil pursuits of literature. He died in December, 1639. He was the author of several small pieces on different subjects, which were published together in a volume entitled '*Reliquiæ Wottonianæ,*' in 1651. The '*State of Christendom*' was first published, in folio, in 1657. Several other pieces of his still remain in manuscript.

Thomas, Earl of Strafford.

BORN A. D. 1593.—DIED A. D. 1641.

THOMAS WENTWORTH, earl of Strafford, the favourite and able, but corrupt minister of Charles I., was the son of Sir William Wentworth, a Yorkshire gentleman, whose family made a distinguished figure among the revivers of popular liberty in the reign of Elizabeth. He was the eldest of twelve children, and was born in London on the 15th of April, 1593. He completed his studies at St John's college, Cambridge, after which he spent a short time on the continent.

On his return from abroad in 1613, he appeared at court, and was

knighted by King James. About the same time he married Margaret Clifford, the eldest daughter of the earl of Cumberland. In the following year he succeeded by the death of his father to a baronetcy, and an estate of £6000 a-year. His great wealth and influence soon pointed him out to the government as a person whose services were likely to be useful in the north of England, and accordingly, on the resignation of Sir John Saville, *Custos rotulorum* for the west riding of Yorkshire, that office was conferred on Wentworth. But he commenced his political career on the side of the opposition. In 1621, he was returned to parliament for the county of York; and such was the spirit he displayed in defending the popular rights against encroachment, that, in 1626, he was appointed a sheriff, for the purpose of being prevented resuming his seat in the house. In the following year he was sent to prison for refusing to contribute to the forced loan.

In Charles's third parliament he again represented the county of York, and joined with Eliot, Phillips, and Seymour, in supporting the petition of right. When some proposed that they should rest satisfied with the king's assurances, without pressing the petition, Wentworth strenuously opposed so dangerous a course, "There hath been," said he, "a public violation of the laws by his majesty's ministers; and nothing shall satisfy me but a public amends. Our desire to vindicate the subjects rights exceeds not what is laid down in former laws, with some modest provision for instruction and performances." When the lords proposed to add to the petition a clause importing that they left entire all the rights and privileges of royalty, and wished to employ the term 'sovereign power' for 'prerogative,' Wentworth exclaimed against the proposition. "If we do admit of this addition," said he, "we shall leave the subject in a worse state than we found him. Let us leave all power to his majesty to bring malefactors to legal punishment; but our laws are not acquainted with 'sovereign power.' We desire no new thing; nor do we offer to trench on his majesty's prerogative; but we may not secede from this petition, either in whole or in part." These were sentiments worthy of a Wentworth; but he who uttered them was destined soon to belie them by the grossest act of apostasy. Buckingham now felt and estimated the value of the man. That abandoned minister had hitherto treated Wentworth with great contempt, but he now saw his mistake, and resolved to retrace his steps; he courted Wentworth, and soon made overtures to him which were accepted. Wentworth had in fact been guided hitherto by ambition only. Repulsed in his first advances towards Buckingham, he at once perceived that the gates of court-favour were shut against him, and that to gain any thing from it, he must work upon the necessities and fears of the king and his minister. Upon this principle he chose his part, and how successfully he supported it let the result show.

His commission as president for the council of the north was the first item in his bargain with the court, and was signed a month before Buckingham's assassination: he was also advanced to the peerage with the title of baron. Hume notices Wentworth's desertion of his party, in language which, while it sounds like an apology, does virtually admit the baseness of his conduct. "His fidelity to the king," says the artful historian, "was unshaken; but as he now employed all his counsels to support the prerogative, which he had formerly bent all his

powers to diminish, his virtue seems not to have been entirely pure, but to have been susceptible of strong impressions from private interest and ambition." The truth is, Wentworth's conduct at this period is utterly incapable of vindication; it has been justly pronounced "a barefaced and deliberate sale of himself, his character, and conscience." The council of York, or of the north, was a fit sphere for such a man. It originated in a commission of oyer and terminer granted to the archbishop of York, and some lawyers and gentlemen closely connected with that large county, so early as the 31st year of Henry VIII., for the purpose of investigating the causes of a recent popular tumult, and bringing the ringleaders to punishment. The commission worked so well for the government, that it was frequently renewed, and that on very slight pretexts. Both Elizabeth and James extended its powers; and under the enlarged instructions granted to Wentworth, the council of York exercised the whole jurisdiction of the four northern counties, and embraced not only the powers of a court of common law, but even the exorbitant authority of the star-chamber. "His commission," says Clarendon, "placed the northern counties entirely beyond the protection of the common law. It included 58 instructions, of which scarcely one did not exceed or directly violate the common law; and, by its natural operation, it had almost overwhelmed the country under the sea of arbitrary power, and involved the people in a labyrinth of distemper, oppression, and poverty."

In 1631, he was appointed lord-deputy of Ireland. Hume says that he governed that country for eight years with great vigilance, activity, and prudence, and that his conduct upon the whole was not only innocent but even laudable, yet it was proved on his trial that he had repeatedly affirmed "that while he was governor he would make an act of state, or an act of the council-board, as good as an act of parliament; that he would not have his orders disputed by law or lawyers; that the Irish were a conquered nation, with whom the king might do as he pleased, and, for their antiquated charters, they were binding no farther than he pleased." He writes to Laud: "I know no reason but you may as well rule the common lawyers in England as I, poor beagle, do here; and yet *that* I do, and will do, in all that concerns my master upon the peril of my head." And he soon after boasts:—"I can now say the king is as absolute here as any prince in the whole world can be." His government of Ireland was a pure military despotism; he not only employed the army to put down all opposition or resistance to his iniquitous and arbitrary measures, but he endeavoured to introduce as many officers as he could into the Irish house of commons for the purpose of securing majorities. In one of his despatches to Charles, after boasting that he had so balanced the protestant and recusant members, in the lower house, as nearly to neutralise both, he adds:—"I will also labour to get as many captains and officers returned as burgesses as I possibly can, who, having immediate dependance on the crown, may almost sway the business which way they please." Such is a specimen of the administration which Hume has pronounced prudent and laudable!

Equally pernicious were the maxims of policy which from time to time he urged his infatuated master to adopt in the government of England. He advises the king to give "seasonable rewards to the judges

for occasional services," and adds that, "by a constant and quick applying of rewards and punishments, he might soon be rendered, both at home and abroad, the most powerful and considerable king in Christendom." In a subsequent letter, after observing that the infamous judgment in the case of ship-money, was "the greatest service the profession of the law had done the crown in his time," he adds, "but unless his majesty has the like power declared to raise a land army upon the same exigent of state, the crown seems to stand but upon one leg at home, and to be considerable but by halves to foreign princes abroad." Again he says, "The debts of the crown being taken off, you may govern as you please: and most resolute I am that may be done without borrowing any help forth of the king's lodgings." All this was sweet counsel to Charles, who rewarded his favourite adviser with the earldom of Strafford in September, 1639, and at the same time changed his title of deputy to that of lord-lieutenant of Ireland.

The impeachment of Strafford was the first blow struck by the champions of freedom in the long parliament. His friends wished him to avoid the approaching storm either by remaining in Yorkshire at the head of the army, or by retiring to Ireland; but he disdained such pusillanimous advice, and boldly threw himself into the teeth of his enemies. He hastened up to the metropolis and sought an interview with his sovereign. The commons were at first a little disconcerted at his unexpected arrival, but after a debate with closed doors, they proceeded in a body to the bar of the lords, where Pym, in their name impeached the earl of high treason. Strafford no sooner heard what was going forward than he rushed to the house, and was proceeding to his place, when a number of voices called upon him to withdraw. On his readmission, the speaker informed him that in consequence of his impeachment, the house had ordered him into the custody of the black rod; he attempted to address the peers, but was instantly silenced, and led out by the usher. The trial took place in Westminster hall, and was watched with the most intense interest by the nation. The principal charges brought against him were the general support of despotism, and various specific acts of misgovernment as lord-lieutenant of Ireland and president of the council of York. He conducted his own defence with great ability. "There certainly never was a grander spectacle of intellectual supremacy and fearlessness presented on any stage. During seventeen days, the thirteen managers for the commons rose successively against him. Alone,—broken with sickness,—surrounded by enemies,—he threw them all in turn, and stood among them like a being of another world."¹ Hume has tortured his ingenuity to misrepresent the whole proceedings in this famous trial. He calls the previous investigation by the committee appointed to prepare the articles of charge, an inquisition; he is greatly indignant because the committee were allowed to examine privy-councillors; and he asserts that the impeachment of Sir George Ratcliffe was only got up on purpose to deprive Strafford of the assistance of his best friend. As to the first of these insinuations, nothing can be clearer than that the committee were entitled to collect evidence to support their charges, and, it is only another instance of the historian's unfairness, to apply to this the hateful

¹ Edin. Rev. vol. xlvii. p. 284.

name of an inquisition. The second insinuation is equally frivolous. The law and practice of evidence was by no means clearly defined at the time; but the doctrine was admitted that a minister of the crown was answerable to his country for the advice he gave his sovereign; and how was the fact of evil advice having been tendered to be ascertained but by the evidence of other members of the council? As to Ratcliffe's impeachment, it is sufficient to state that he was the principal accomplice of Strafford in his acts of misgovernment in Ireland, and that whatever tended to criminate the one criminated the other also. Ratcliffe was worthy of sharing the fate of his master; but the magnanimity of the English commons forbade more than one sacrifice to public justice. Let us now briefly attend to the articles of charge, and the defence put forth by Hume with respect to them. We have seen that that historian pronounced Strafford's Irish administration to have been "innocent and even laudable." We need not multiply proofs of the despotism, rapacity, and cruelty which characterised this laudable administration: one single case—and we will quote it in the words of Hume himself—will suffice as a specimen of it. "It had been reported at the table of Lord-chancellor Loftus, that Annesley, one of the deputy's attendants, in moving a stool had sorely hurt his master's foot, who was at that time afflicted with the gout. 'Perhaps,' said Mountnorris, who was present at table, 'it was done in revenge of that public affront which my lord-deputy formerly put upon him: But he has a brother who would not have taken such a revenge.' This casual, and seemingly innocent, at least ambiguous expression, was reported to Strafford, who, on pretence that such a suggestion might prompt Annesley to avenge himself in another manner, ordered Mountnorris, who was an officer, to be tried by a court-martial for mutiny and sedition against his general. The court, which consisted of the chief officers of the army, found the crime to be capital, and condemned that nobleman to lose his head." More unjust, if possible, and vindictive was his treatment of Lord Ely. That nobleman was thrown into prison in order to compel him to settle his estate in a manner agreeable to his daughter-in-law, a paramour of the lord-lieutenant. As to the misdeeds of the council of York, Hume thinks it a sufficient defence for Strafford to say that he never in person presided in that court. It is a sufficient reply to this, however, that every public functionary is responsible for the acts and deeds of his deputy, especially if that deputy be appointed by him and removeable at his pleasure. It has been argued that the articles exhibited against Strafford did not strictly amount to high treason; he took up this ground of defence himself, and argued technically that he was not a traitor according to the legal definition of the word. At last the commons dropped the impeachment and brought in a bill of attainder, which, in spite of strong opposition, was read a third time and passed the commons on the eleventh day. Several conscientious men, among whom was Selden, voted against the bill, but neither Hyde nor Falkland, nor many of the respectable royalists seem to have opposed it.

Mr Brodie and Mr Godwin justify the bill of attainder. Mr Hallam defends the principle, but objects to the severity of the punishment. For our own part, we are satisfied with Mr Godwin's reasoning on this point. "No one," says that acute and impartial historian, "can question

the guilt of the earl of Strafford; his accusation and his conviction were of the substance of eternal right; his defence was technical. Several conscientious men in those days were on the whole for his acquittal; more have been so since. We argue the case in cool blood; and are not made clear-sighted by the actually flowing and existing light of the public welfare, which then discovered what was requisite to be done. Law is made for man; and not man for the law. Whenever we can be sure that the most valuable interests of a nation require that we should decide one way, that way we ought to decide. Strafford was at that day the most dangerous man to the liberties of England then present, and to come, that could live. It has been suggested in relation to this case, that, 'when once a man is in a situation to be tried, and his person in the power of his accusers and his judges, he can no longer be formidable in that degree which alone can justify (if any thing can) the violation of the substantial rules of criminal proceedings.' Hampden, and Pym, and the great men who then consulted together for the public welfare, I believe, in their consciences judged otherwise. They understood the character of the king, and of all the parties concerned with him, better than we can pretend to do. They foresaw the probability of a civil war. They foresaw, which was more than this, the various schemes that would be formed for dispersing the parliament by force of arms, and they knew that Strafford would prove the most inventive and audacious undertaker for this nefarious purpose. Whatever engagements Charles had entered into, 'of removing Strafford from his presence and councils for ever,' he would have considered these as annulled the moment the sword was drawn. The prince, who contemplated the bringing the army to overawe the parliament before it had sat two months, and who negotiated afterwards to bring over an army of Irish catholics, such as were the Irish catholics of those days, to settle the difference between himself and his people, certainly would not have scrupled the employing of Strafford. Hampden and Pym, and their allies, judged they did wisely, and acted like true patriots, by removing this obstacle before the contention began. A proviso was inserted in the act of attainder of the case of Strafford, that 'no judges or other magistrates should adjudge any thing to be treason in any other manner than they would have adjudged if this act had never been made.' This has been used as an argument to prove that the prosecutors of Strafford were conscious of the injustice they committed. It proves no such thing. It rather serves to illustrate the clearness of their conceptions and the equability of their temper. Undoubtedly the prosecutors of Strafford were firmly averse to this proceeding being drawn into a precedent. Undoubtedly they were strongly persuaded that in all ordinary cases the letter of the law should be observed, and no man be condemned unless that were against him."²

While the bill of attainder was pending in the lower house, the lords proceeded with the impeachment as if ignorant respecting the intentions of the commons, and Strafford made his defence before them. It was a fine specimen of eloquence, and contained much powerful reasoning against the principle of constructive treason. In conclusion he appealed to his peers in these words: "My lords, it is *my* present misfortune, it

² Hist. of the Commonwealth.

may hereafter be *yours*. Except your lordships provide for it, the shedding of my blood will make way for the shedding of yours: you, your estates, your posterities be at stake. If such learned gentlemen as these, whose tongues are well-acquainted with such proceedings, shall be started out against you; if your friends, your counsel, shall be denied access to you; if your professed enemies shall be admitted witnesses against you; if every word, intention, or circumstance, be sifted and alleged as treasonable, not because of any statute, but because of a consequence or construction pieced up in a high rhetorical strain,—I leave it to your lordships' consideration to foresee what may be the issue of such a dangerous and recent precedent. These gentlemen tell me they speak in defence of the commonwealth against my arbitrary laws: give me leave to say it, I speak in defence of the commonwealth against their arbitrary treason. This, my lords, regards you and your posterity. For myself, were it not for your interest, and for the interest of a saint in heaven, who hath left me here two pledges upon earth," (at these words the earl appeared to be deeply affected, and tears ran down his cheeks,) "were it not for this," he resumed, "I should never take the pains to keep up this ruinous cottage of mine. I could never leave the world at a fitter time, when I hope the better part of the world think that by this my misfortune I have given testimony of my integrity to my God, my king, and my country. My lords, something more I had to say, but my voice and my spirits fail me. Only in all submission I crave that I may be a pharos to keep you from shipwreck. Do not put rocks in your way which no prudence, no circumspection, can eschew. Whatever your judgment may be, shall be righteous in my eyes. *In te Domine*. (here he raised his eyes towards heaven,) *confido: non confundar in æternum!*" Principal Baillie, who was present, and has given an interesting account of the trial in his letters to the presbytery of Irvine, says: "At the end he made such a pathetic oration for half an hour as ever comedian did on the stage. The matter and expression was exceeding brave. Doubtless if he had grace and civil goodness, he is a most eloquent man. One passage is most spoken of,—his breaking off in weeping and silence when he spoke of his first wife. Some took it for a true defect in his memory; others, for a notable part of his rhetoric; some, that true grief and remorse at that remembrance had stopt his mouth. For they say, that his first lady being with child, and, finding one of his mistress's letters, brought it to him, and chiding him therefore, he struck her on the breast, whereof she shortly died."²

When the bill of attainder had passed both houses, and awaited the royal assent, information was received of a conspiracy, instigated by Charles, to bring the army to London, rescue Strafford, and dissolve the parliament. This discovery precipitated the fate of the guilty minister; the commons demanded his instant execution, the populace of London became ungovernable, and Charles at last subscribed with tears a commission to give assent to the bill. As a last effort to save the life of his favourite, he sent a letter to the lords, by the hands of the young prince of Wales, beseeching the two houses, as a personal favour, to commute the earl's punishment of death into that of perpetual

² Baillie, 291.

imprisonment. The application was rejected, and on the 11th of May Strafford was led to the scaffold.

Robert, Lord Willoughby.

BORN A. D. 1582.—DIED A. D. 1642.

ROBERT BERTIE, lord-high-chamberlain of England, in the reign of Charles I., and first earl of Lindsey, was the eldest son of Peregrine, Lord Willoughby of Eresby, by Mary, daughter of John Vere, earl of Oxford. He was born in 1582, and succeeded to his father's title and estate in 1601. "He, and that whole family," says Lloyd, "I knew not whether more pious, or more valiant, whether more renowned abroad as confessors for their religion, or as champions for their country,—have been in this last age an ornament and a defence to this crown,—equally revered by the subjects of it, and honoured by the sovereigns."

In the first year of James the first's reign, Lord Willoughby claimed the earldom of Oxford, and the office of lord-high-chamberlain of England, in virtue of his mother's right, and in the same year, he took his seat in the house of lords above all the barons. On the 22d of November, 1626, he was advanced to the dignity of earl of Lindsey. In 1635, he was constituted lord-high-admiral of England. In 1640, he sat as lord-high-constable of England at the trial of Strafford; and in 1642, he was constituted general-in-chief of the king's forces, but the title was almost an empty one, for the king generally guided himself by the advice of Prince Rupert in all military matters. On the 23d of October, the same year, he fell gallantly at the battle of Edgehill, while leading on his regiment with a pike in his hand. He was carried from the field to the next village, where his wounds were dressed, and much attention shown him by the victors, but he died in the surgeon's hands the succeeding day. A contemporary says of him, "He was a person of no likely presence, but of considerable experience by his former expeditions, and one that, to the last of his life, made good his faith with gallantry and courage, notwithstanding his ill success."

John Hampden.

BORN A. D. 1594.—DIED A. D. 1643.

JOHN HAMPDEN, the most illustrious of English patriots, was born in 1594. His father was a gentleman of Buckinghamshire, who represented East Looe in 1593. His mother was the second daughter of Sir Henry Cromwell of Hinchinbrooke. In 1609, young Hampden was entered as commoner at Magdalen college, Oxford. In 1613, he was admitted to the Inner temple. In 1619, he married Elizabeth, only daughter of Edmund Symeon of Pyrton, in Oxfordshire. On the 30th of January, 1620, he first took his seat in the house of commons. The borough of Grampound, then a place of no inconsider-

able importance, had the honour of first sending this incorruptible patriot to parliament.

During the first year, he did not take any very active share in the management of public business. He spoke but seldom; but he served in several committees, and joined in the remonstrance against the marriage of Prince Charles with the infant. A party were at this moment forming, with the view of checking the inordinate influence of the crown. Among its more distinguished members were Selden, Pym, Sir John Wentworth, Coke, and Eliot. To this party and its principles Hampden attached himself.

In Charles's first parliament Hampden was returned for Wendover. In the second parliament of that monarch he again represented Wendover; and on its dissolution rendered himself obnoxious to the court by refusing to pay his proportion of the general loan, which the king was raising on his own authority. When asked his reason for this conduct, he boldly replied, "that he could be content to lend as well as others, but feared to draw upon himself that curse in *Magna charta* which should be read twice a year against those who infringe it."¹ The privy council hereupon committed him to a close and rigorous imprisonment for a time in the gate-house. At last when the failure of Buckingham's second expedition against the isle of Rhe, suggested the expediency of conciliatory measures, Hampden was unconditionally restored to full liberty, along with seventy-seven other persons of various conditions, by an order of the council-board. During the important session which opened in March, 1627, Hampden again sat as member for Wendover. He was now a marked character, and deemed fit to be associated with St John, Selden, Coke, and Pym, in various important committees.

After the arrest of Eliot and Digges, and before the dissolution of the parliament of 1628-9, Hampden retired to his estate in Buckinghamshire, where he devoted himself chiefly to the study of history and political science. Davila's '*History of the civil Wars of France*' became his favourite author,—his *vade mecum*, as Sir Philip Warwick styles it,—as if with prophetic sagacity he already foresaw the bursting of that cloud which was now gathering over his country. The death of his amiable consort at this time inflicted a deep wound on his domestic happiness. She left him three sons, John, Richard, and William, and six daughters. Of these, Elizabeth, the eldest, was married soon after to Richard Knightley, the son of one of Hampden's most esteemed compatriots. The second, Anne, married Sir Robert Pye. Besides these alliances, Hampden had other powerful connexions amongst the country party. Edward Waller was his first cousin by the mother's side, and Oliver Cromwell stood related to him in the same degree.

In the spring of 1636, Hampden took his decisive stand against the payment of ship-money; and his example of resistance was followed by nearly the whole county of Buckingham. D'Israeli has attempted to explain away the whole principle of Hampden's resistance into a little piece of petty pique:—"I have been informed," says he, "of papers in the possession of a family of the highest respectability, which

¹ Rushworth.

will show that Hampden had long lived in a state of civil warfare with his neighbour, the sheriff of the county. They mutually harassed each other. It is probable that these papers may relate to quarrels about levying the sixpence in the pound on Hampden's estate, for which he was assessed. It is from the jealousy of truth that we are anxious to learn whether the sixpence was refused out of pique to his old enemy and neighbour the sheriff, or from the purest, unmixed, patriotism."

Lord Nugent thus refutes this paltry piece of calumny:—"It is not often that to imputations so insinuated, a negative can be proved; but in this case it may. Sir Peter Temple was the sheriff, whose official act it was to enforce this ill-founded demand, and to whom, in this matter, Hampden was opposed, and on whose writ the issue was tried. His papers and correspondence are at Stowe, and I have carefully examined them. There is not, in that collection, the shadow of evidence of any private pique or quarrel; nor does the sheriff, nor do those before whom the case came to trial, nor does Lord Clarendon, or any other writer equally unfavourably disposed toward Hampden, impute or appear to suspect any such motive."²

On the 20th of March a writ of *Scire facias* was awarded against Hampden. After various preliminary proceedings, the point of law was argued in Michaelmas term, on the part of Hampden, by Oliver, Sir John, and Holbourne; and for the crown, by the attorney-general Sir John Banks, and the solicitor Sir Edward Littleton. The result is already known to the reader. The crown obtained an impure and collusive verdict by a small majority, while the conduct of Hampden was universally applauded. "The eyes of all men," says Clarendon, "were fixed upon him as their *Pater patriæ*, and the pilot who must steer the vessel through the tempests and rocks that threatened it." Hampden at first seemed disposed to shrink from the service to which he was called by the voice of the nation. He had, in fact, embarked with his relative Cromwell on board a vessel about to sail for America, but a special order having been issued for the detention of the ship, the two patriots again stepped on shore, "the one to be the first mover of resistance in arms against the power of the king,—the other to finally defeat and ruin that power in the field, to overthrow the monarchy, and to bring the sovereign, by whom he was now arbitrarily detained, to a public scaffold."³ Hume, in his usual sneering way, avers that Hampden and his compatriots were going to New England, prompted by no other motive than their desire to hear sermons of seven hours in length. Granting it were so, was the government any more to be vindicated on this account for forcibly detaining them? But the jest, sorry as it is, is not even borne out by the facts of the case. It was the gross infraction of the petition of right which had so disgusted Hampden and his companions, that they preferred exile to slavery in their own country. And as to the long sermons, Hume has overlooked the fact, that Hampden and Cromwell, and their followers, were independents, and not presbyterians. Long sermons were only in fashion among the latter.

"During the whole of the three last eventful years of his life, which were now beginning," says his noble biographer, "his mind, which before

² Memorials, vol. i. p. 225.

³ Nugent, vol. i. p. 257.

had been occasionally applied to unconnected pursuits, was, without intermission, employed in that uniform course of public service, to which his great duties, and his own deep sense of them, now wholly bound him. Never inactive, he had hitherto divided his time between the business of parliament, the study of books, and the amusements as well as the useful occupations of a country life. As a magistrate, he had borne a diligent share in the local affairs of his county; but he had also found leisure for indulging himself in 'an exceeding prepenseness to field-sports,' and in the embellishment of his paternal estate, of which he was very fond. When, therefore, he finally abandoned all these pursuits and habits of social ease, which his temper, and talents, and the mild virtues of his domestic character, so much inclined and fitted him to enjoy, the motive must have been powerful, and the sacrifice great.

"From this time till his death, except at some few hasty intervals, when business of public concern called him from the parliament, from the council, or from the camp, he never again returned to that home to which the remembrances of his youth, his studies, his pleasures, and the blameless happiness of tranquil hours, had so strongly attached him.

"His mansion still remains. It stands away from both the principal roads which pass through Buckinghamshire, at the back of that chalky range of the Chilterns, which bounds on one side the vale of Aylesbury. The scenery which immediately surrounds it, from its seclusion little known, is of singular beauty, opening upon a ridge which commands a very extensive view over several counties, and diversified by dells, clothed with a natural growth of box, juniper, and beech. What has once been the abode of such a man can never but be interesting from the associations which belong to it. But, even forgetting these, no one, surely, who has heart or taste for the charm of high breezy hills, and green glades enclosed within the shadowy stillness of ancient woods and avenues leading to a house, on whose walls the remains of the different styles of architecture, from the early Norman to the Tudor, are still partly traced through the deforming innovations of the eighteenth century,—no one, surely, can visit the residence of Hampden, and not do justice to the love which its master bore it, and to that stronger feeling which could lead him from such a retirement to the toils and perils to which, thenceforth, he entirely devoted himself."⁴

In the parliament which met on the 3d of November, 1640, Hampden was returned both for the borough of Wendover and for the county of Buckingham. He made his election for the county. Strafford's impeachment now engaged his utmost attention; but it is pretty clear that he disapproved of the procedure by bill. It has been asked, why then did he not oppose it? "Plainly," says Lord Nugent, "because in a case doubtful to him only, as matter of precedent, but clear to him in respect of the guilt of the accused person,—in a case in which the accused person, in his estimation, deserved death, and in which all law but that of the sceptre and the sword was at an end if he had escaped it,—when all the ordinary protection of law to the subject throughout the country was suspended, and suspended mainly by the

⁴ Nugent, vol. ii. p. 287, *et seq.*

counsels of Strafford himself,—Hampden was not prepared to heroically immolate the liberties of England, in order to save the life of him who would have destroyed them.”

We next find Hampden, in conjunction with the lords Say and Kimbolton, Nathaniel Fiennes, and the younger Vane, urging the abolition of episcopacy. At first he supported the more moderate measure of reform in the church, but from the time of the rejection of the bill to restrain the bishops from voting and holding civil offices, he resolved to make no compromise with the high-church party. Soon after the committal of Strafford and Laud to prison, and when several of the king's other ministers had fled, a negotiation was opened for admitting the leaders of the country party into office. Pym was to have been chancellor of the exchequer in the room of Cottington; Holles, secretary of state; and Lord Essex governor, and Hampden tutor to the prince of Wales.⁵ One feels curious to know what effect this arrangement would have had on the face of public affairs had it been gone into at this strange and critical juncture, and particularly what effect Hampden's training would have had on such a character as Charles II., who was now little more than ten years of age. The negotiation failed however, and we cannot afford space for conjectural results.

The bill against episcopacy was yet pending when Charles suddenly announced his intention of visiting Scotland. His secret object was a double intrigue with the English officers and the Scottish covenanters; his professed one, to allay disorders amongst the troops, and prepare them to disband in quietness. The commons urged the inexpediency of such an expensive journey in the present exhausted state of the treasury, and the propriety of at least delaying it until the two armies now on the frontier were paid off; but the king was not to be moved, and immediately set out for his northern capital. Parliament then appointed a committee to watch, and, if possible, to thwart the king's negotiations with the covenanters. Clarendon applies the epithet of spies to this committee, and Hume of course eagerly adopts the designation, yet these spies were openly appointed by the votes of both houses, and openly proceeded to where Charles held his court. The commissioners from the lords were the earl of Bedford and lord Howard of Escricke; and for the commons, Hampden, Fiennes, Sir W. Stapleton, and Sir W. Armyne. Hampden was the soul and life of the commission, and conducted the principal part of the correspondence with London, until upon the discovery of ‘the Incident,’ as it was called, he and his colleagues returned to London, and resumed their seats in the houses.

Charles' memorable and fatal attempt to seize the five members, of whom Hampden was one, has already been noticed with sufficiency of detail. Hampden's address to the house on this occasion was a very powerful one. He said he would not enter on the particulars of the charge, for the evidence in support of them had not yet been opened to the house; but, as was necessary, when the terms loyalty, obedience, and resistance, had been so loosely employed, he particularized upon these several duties as constituting the difference between a good and a bad subject. He divided them under the heads of “Religion towards

⁵ Whitlocke, p. 41.

God, loyalty and due submission to the lawful commands of the sovereign, and good affections towards the safety and just rights of the people, according to the ancient and fundamental laws of the realm." Concerning religion, he claimed the right of determining by searching the sacred writings, in which 'are contained all things necessary to salvation;' he contrasted this law with the doctrine and discipline of the church of Rome, and averred that 'all other sects and schisms that lean not only on the Scriptures, though never so contrary to the church of Rome, 'are a false worshipping of God, and not the true religion.' He then proceeded to define the limits and extent of lawful obedience to the sovereign, 'acting with the free consent of his great council of state, assembled in parliament. For the first, to deny a willing and dutiful obedience to a lawful sovereign and his privy council (for, as Camden truly saith, the commands of the lords privy councillors, and the edict of the prince is one, they are inseparable, the one never without the other,) to deny to defend the royal person and kingdoms against the enemies of the same, either public or private, or to deny to defend the ancient privileges and prerogatives of the king, as pertinent and belonging of right to his royal crown, and the maintenance of his honour and dignity, or to deny to defend and maintain true religion in the land, according to the truth of God, is one sign of an evil subject. Secondly, to yield obedience to the commands of a king, if against the true religion, and the ancient and fundamental laws of the land, is another sign of an ill subject. Thirdly, to resist the lawful power of the king, to raise insurrection against the king, admit him averse in his religion, to conspire or in any way to rebel against his sacred person, though commanding things against our consciences in exercising religion, or against the rights and privileges of the subject, is an absolute sign of a disaffected and traitorous subject. Of the means to know the difference between a good subject and a bad, 'by their obedience to the laws, statutes, and ordinances made by the king, with the whole consent of his parliament,' he spoke thus:—'First, I conceive, if any particular member of a parliament, although his judgment and vote be contrary, do not willingly submit to the rest, he is an ill subject to his king and country; and, secondly, to resist the ordinance of the whole state of the kingdom, either by the stirring up a dislike in the hearts of his majesty's subjects of the proceedings of the parliament, to endeavour, by levying arms, to compel the king and parliament to make such laws as seem best to them, to deny the power, authority, and privileges of parliament, to cast aspersions upon the same and its proceedings, thereby inducing the king to think ill of the same, and to be incensed against the same, to procure the untimely breaking up and dissolution of a parliament, before all things be settled by the same, for the safety and tranquillity both of king and State, these are apparent signs of a treacherous and disloyal subject against his king and country. I humbly desire my actions may be compared with either; and both as a subject, a protestant, as a native of this my country, and as I am a member of this present and happy parliament, that I be esteemed, as I shall be found guilty upon these articles exhibited against myself and the other gentlemen, to be a bad or a good subject to my sovereign and native country; and to receive

such sentence upon the same as by this honourable house shall be conceived to agree with law and justice."⁶

The first year of the civil war, grievous on so many public accounts to Hampden, was a time of great domestic affliction also to him. Soon after the outbreak his eldest son died, and almost immediately after, his favourite and beloved daughter, Mrs Knightley. Two of his first cousins also brought dishonour on the family name, by engaging in Edmund Waller's plot. After mustering the strength of Buckinghamshire for the approaching contest, Hampden took the command at Northampton, with a small brigade of infantry and some guns, his colleague, Arthur Goodwyn, accompanying him with his regiment of cavalry. From Northampton he moved to the support of Lord Brook, who commanded the right wing of Essex's army. The unfortunate indecision which characterized Essex was extremely mortifying to the ardent and active mind of Hampden, who often found it difficult to yield the obedience of a good soldier to his general's orders. He had always advised an instant advance upon Oxford as the surest means of bringing the struggle to a speedy termination; but the lord-general, until peremptorily ordered by the close committee of parliament, made no forward movement. At last he had nearly invested Oxford when the partial success of the royalists in the west moved him to detach a part of his army in that direction, and to concentrate his force nearer London.

A sharp campaign followed in the west, after which Prince Rupert commenced a series of incursions into Buckinghamshire. Hampden was at this time attending to his parliamentary duties in London, but upon hearing that Rupert was threatening Aylesbury, he immediately posted to his charge, and marched his regiment from Wycombe to reinforce Colonel Bustrade at Aylesbury. Rupert having retreated, Hampden joined the advanced guard of Essex's army, now on its march to besiege Reading. That place having surrendered, Essex exhausted the patience of his troops by continuing to act on the defensive, with extensive, and consequently feeble and ill-connected lines. In these circumstances, the troops were loud in their complaints against the earl, and called upon parliament to place Hampden at their head. But the career of this popular soldier was drawing to a close. On the 18th of June, Rupert made a sudden and successful attack upon Chinnor. Hampden, on the first alarm, sent off a trooper to the lord-general at Thame, to advise moving a force to Chiselhampton bridge, the only point at which Rupert could recross the river, while he instantly mounted, and, with a troop of horse, endeavoured to harass and impede the retreat until Essex should have made his dispositions. Rupert retired through Tetsworth, and drew up in order of battle at Chalgrove-field, where a fierce fight began, every effort being made to keep Rupert hotly engaged till reinforcements should arrive from Essex. "Hampden," says his noble biographer, "put himself at the head of the attack; but, in the first charge, he received his death. He was struck in his shoulder with two carabine balls, which, breaking the bone, entered his body, and his arm hung powerless and shattered by his side. Sheffield was severely wounded, and fell into the hands of the enemy. Overwhelmed by numbers, their best officers killed or

⁶ Speech *apud* Nugent, vol. ii. pp. 130—133.

taken, the great leader of their hopes and of their cause thus dying among them, and the day absolutely lost, the parliamentarians no longer kept their ground. Essex came up too late; and Rupert, though unable to pursue, made good his retreat across the river to Oxford. Thus ended the fight of that fatal morning when Hampden shed his blood, closing the great work of his toilsome life with a brilliant reputation and an honourable death; crowned, not, as some happier men, with the renown of victory, but with a testimony not less glorious, of fidelity to the sinking fortunes of a conflict which his genius might have more prosperously guided to a better issue.

‘Disce virtutem ex hoc, verumque laborem,
‘Fortunam ex aliis.’

His head bending down, and his hands resting on his horse's neck, he was seen riding off the field before the action was done,—‘a thing,’ says Lord Clarendon, ‘he never used to do, and from which it was concluded he was hurt.’ It is a tradition, that he was seen first moving in the direction of his father-in-law's (Simeon's) house at Pyrton. There he had in youth married the first wife of his love, and thither he would have gone to die. But Rupert's cavalry were covering the plain between. Turning his horse, therefore, he rode back across the grounds of Hazeley in his way to Thame. At the brook, which divides the parishes, he paused awhile; but, it being impossible for him, in his wounded state, to remount, if he had alighted to turn his horse over, he suddenly summoned his strength, clapped spurs, and cleared the leap. In great pain, and almost fainting, he reached Thame, and was conducted to the house of one Ezekiel Browne, where, his wounds being dressed, the surgeons would, for a while, have given him hopes of life, but he felt that his hurt was mortal, and, indulging no weak expectations of recovery, occupied the few days that remained to him in despatching letters of counsel to the parliament in prosecution of his favourite plan. While the irresolute and lazy spirit which had directed the army in the field should continue to preside in the counsel of war, Hampden had reason to despair of the great forward movement to which he had throughout looked for the success of the cause. And now the reinforcements which were pouring into Oxford from the north, and the weakened condition of the parliament, made the issue of this more doubtful. His last urgent advice was to concentrate the position of the army covering the London road, and provide well for the threatened safety of the metropolis,—and thus to rouse the troops from the mortifying remembrance of their late disasters to vigorous preparations, which yet might lead, by a happier fortune, in turn, to a successful attack. This was his last message,—like that from the dying consul, after Cannæ, to the senate of his country:—‘Abi, nuncia patribus urbem munit, ac, priusquam hostis victor adveniat, præidiis firmant. . . . Me, in hac strage meorum patere expirare, ne aut reus e consulatu sim, aut accusator collegæ existam, ut alieno crimine innocentiam meam protegam.’

“After nearly six days of acute suffering, his bodily powers no longer sufficed to pursue or conclude the business of his earthly work. About seven hours before his death he received the sacrament of the Lord's supper, declaring, that ‘though he could not away with the governance

of the church by bishops, and did utterly abominate the scandalous lives of some clergymen, he thought its doctrine in the great part primitive and conformable to God's words, as in Holy Scripture revealed.' He was attended by Dr Giles, the rector of Chinnor, with whom he had lived in habits of close friendship, and by Dr Spurstow, an Independent minister, the chaplain to his regiment. At length, being well nigh spent, and labouring for breath, he turned himself to die in prayer. 'O Lord God of Hosts,' said he, 'great is thy mercy, just and holy are thy dealings unto us sinful men! Save me, O Lord, if it be thy good will, from the jaws of death! Pardon my manifold transgressions. O Lord, save my bleeding country! Have these realms in the special keeping. Confound and level in the dust those who would rob the people of their liberty and lawful prerogative. Let the king see his error, and turn the hearts of his wicked counsellors from the malice and wickedness of their designs. Lord Jesus, receive my soul!' He then mournfully uttered, 'O Lord save my country.—O Lord, be merciful to'. and here his speech failed him. He fell back in the bed, and expired."

John Pym.

BORN A. D. 1584.—DIED A. D. 1643.

JOHN PYM, the worthy colleague of the illustrious Hampden, was descended of a good family in Somersetshire. He was born in 1584. In his fifteenth year he entered as a gentleman-commoner of Broadgate's hall, now Pembroke college, Oxford, where he had for his tutor Degory Wheare. He seems to have left the university without taking a degree, and studied for some time in one of the inns of court. While yet a very young man he was appointed to an office in the exchequer; and soon after returned to parliament as member for Tavistock. From his first taking his seat in the house, he distinguished himself by his unflinching opposition to arbitrary measures, and his intrepid defence of the rights and privileges of parliament "with a courage," says Lord Nugent, "that never quailed, a vigilance that never slept, a severity sharp as the sunbeam to penetrate, and rapid as the thunderbolt to consume, Pym was the undaunted, indefatigable, implacable foe, of every measure, and of every man, that threatened to assail the power of the parliament, or to destroy the great work which was in hand for the people and posterity." He was always ready for debate, and his authority on points of parliamentary practice was hardly inferior to that of Selden himself. His ruling maxim was that which he expressed on Strafford's impeachment: "Parliaments, without parliamentary power, are but a fair and plausible way into bondage."

In 1626, he was one of the managers of Buckingham's impeachment; and in 1628, he accused Dr Mainwaring in the house of commons, of promulgating doctrines subversive of the true interests both of the king and state. In the eventful parliament of 1640, he took so conspicuous a part and displayed so great abilities, that he was thenceforth regarded as one of the principal props of the country-party. Perhaps, his influence in the house at this period exceeded that of any other of the

popular leaders. "He combined in his own person the most accurate research; and the most perfect talent for arranging and conducting of business, with an intellect, not subdued by the fulness in which he possessed the knowledge of precedents and approved practice, but of the highest courage and the utmost firmness that were to be found even in these extraordinary times."¹

On the meeting of the long parliament, the task of leading the opposition was committed to Pym, Hampden, and St John; and the impeachment of 'the great apostate,' Strafford, was principally entrusted to Pym, who acquitted himself in the arduous task with the greatest ability and the most unshrinking resolution. It is recorded of him that when Strafford, shortly after his elevation to the peerage, suddenly came upon two or three of his former associates, and addressing them familiarly said, "Well, you see I have left you!" The answer of the stern and resolute leader was, "Yes, my lord, but we will never leave you while that head is on your shoulders." How faithfully he executed his threat, the fate of Strafford testifies. On the last day of the trial he made, says Baillie, "in half an hour, one of the most eloquent, wise, and free speeches that we ever heard, or I think shall ever hear. I believe the king (he was present) never heard a lecture of so free language against his idolized prerogative."

In 1643, when the commons determined on impeaching the queen, for high treason against the parliament and kingdom, the articles were carried up to the house of lords by the hands of Pym. His death at the close of the same year was a severe loss to the commonwealth. "He was at that time," says Clarendon, "the most popular man that ever lived. He had a very comely and grave way of expressing himself, with great volubility of words, natural and proper, and understood the temper and affections of the kingdom as well as any man." Very active attempts were made to malign the memory of this great and good man. Some of the insinuations thrown out against him were of the most frivolous and contemptible kind. One very absurd one was that he had won over the beauteous countess of Carlisle, by a softer influence than that of politics, to the interest of his party. A graver allegation was that he had taken a heavy bribe from the French monarchy; but the charge was never supported with the slightest shadow of evidence, and is sufficiently refuted by the fact that Pym was always remarkable for the simplicity approaching to austerity of his living, and, notwithstanding his many opportunities to enrich himself, actually did not leave enough to pay his debts. The parliament voted £10,000 for this purpose; and he was interred in Westminster abbey at the public expence.

Cary, Viscount Falkland.

BORN A. D. 1610.—DIED A. D. 1643.

LUCIUS CARY, Viscount Falkland, was the eldest son of Henry, Viscount Falkland, lord-deputy of Ireland. He was born about the year 1610, and received his academical learning at Trinity college,

¹ Godwin.

Dublin, and St John's college, Cambridge. About the time of his father's death, in 1633, he was made one of the gentlemen of the privy-chamber to Charles I. He had hitherto been distinguished chiefly for his love of letters and philosophical retirement. It is said that before he had completed his twenty-third year, he had read over all the Greek and Latin fathers. His ample fortune enabled him to gratify his literary propensities to the utmost, and he caused books to be transmitted to him from all quarters of Europe. In 1639, he laid aside the more tranquil habits of a scholar, for those of the military profession. He joined the expedition sent that year against Scotland, and afterwards accompanied, as a volunteer, the earl of Essex.

In 1640, he entered on a new and still more arduous career, having been returned member for Newport in the isle of Wight. Clarendon has given a pretty fair account of Falkland's conduct and principles at this eventful crisis. He says that at first he declared himself very sharply and severely against those exorbitances of the court, which had been most grievous to the state. He was so rigid an observer of established laws and rules, that he could not endure a breach or deviation from them; and thought no mischief so intolerable as the presumption of ministers of state to break positive rules for reasons of state, or judges to transgress known laws upon the plea of conveniency or necessity. This made him so severe against the earl of Strafford and the lord Finch, contrary to his natural gentleness and temper. He likewise concurred in the first bill to take away the votes of bishops in the house of lords. This gave occasion to some to believe that he was no friend to the church, and the established government of it; it also caused many in the house of commons to imagine and hope that he might be brought to a further compliance with their designs. Indeed the great opinion he had of the uprightness and integrity of those persons who appeared most active against the court, kept him longer from suspecting against the peace of the kingdom; and though he differed from them commonly in conclusions, he believed their purposes were honest. When better informed what was law, and discerning in them a desire to contract that law by a vote of one or both houses, no man more opposed those attempts, and gave the adverse party more trouble, by reason and argumentation. About six months after passing the above mentioned-bill for taking away the bishops' votes, when the same argument came again into debate, he changed his opinion, and gave the house all the opposition he could, insomuch that he was by degrees looked upon as an advocate for the court; to which he contributed so little, that he declined those addresses, and even those invitations which he was obliged almost by civility to entertain. He was so jealous of the least imagination of his inclining to preferment, that he affected moroseness to the court and to the courtiers, and left nothing undone which might prevent and divert the king's or queen's favour towards him, but the deserving it. When the king sent for him once or twice to speak to him, and to give him thanks for his excellent comportment in those councils which his majesty termed doing him service, his answers were more negligent and less satisfactory than might be expected; as if he cared only that his actions should be just, not that they should be acceptable; and he took more pains, and more forced his nature to actions unagrecable and unpleasant to it, that he might not be thought

to incline to the court, than most men have done to procure an office there: not that he was in truth averse to receiving public employment, for he had a great devotion to the king's person, and had before used some small endeavour to be recommended to him for a foreign negotiation, and had once a desire to be sent ambassador into France; but he abhorred an imagination or doubt should sink into the thoughts of any man, that in the discharge of his trust and duty in parliament he had any bias to the court, or that the king himself should apprehend that he looked for a reward for being honest. For this reason, when he heard it first whispered, that the king had a purpose to make him a privy-councillor, for which there was in the beginning no other ground but because he was known to be well-qualified, he resolved to decline it; and at last suffered himself to be over-ruled by the advice and persuasion of his friends to submit to it. Afterwards, when he found that the king intended to make him secretary of state, he was positive to refuse it, declaring to his friends that he was most unfit for it, and that he must either do that which would be great disquiet to his own nature, or leave that undone which was most necessary to be done by one that was honoured with that place; for the most just and honest men did, every day, that which he could not give himself to do. He was so exact and strict an observer of justice and truth, that he believed those necessary condescensions and applications to the weakness of other men, and those arts and insinuations which are necessary for discoveries and prevention of ill, would be in him a declension from his own rules of life, though he acknowledged them fit, and absolutely necessary to be practised in those employments. However, he was at last prevailed upon to submit to the king's command, and became his secretary: but two things he could never bring himself to whilst he continued in that office (which was to his death), for which he was contented to be reproached as for omissions in a most necessary part of his place. The one, employing of spies, or giving any countenance or entertainment to them; not such emissaries, as with danger would venture to view the enemy's camp, and bring intelligence of their number, or quartering, or any particulars that such an observation can comprehend; but those who, by communication of guilt, or dissimulation of manners, wind themselves into such trusts and secrets, as enable them to make discoveries. The other, the liberty of opening letters, upon a suspicion that they might contain matters of dangerous consequence. For the first, he would say, such instruments must be void of all ingenuity and common honesty before they could be of use, and afterwards they could never be fit to be credited: and that no single preservation could be worth so general a wound and corruption of human society, as the cherishing such persons would carry with it. The last he thought such a violation of the law of nature, that no qualification by office could justify him in the trespass; and though he was convinced by the necessity and iniquity of the time, that those advantages of information were not to be declined, and were necessarily to be practised, he found means to put it off from himself, whilst he confessed he needed excuse and pardon for the omission. In all other particulars he filled his place with great sufficiency, being well versed in languages, and with the utmost integrity, being above corruption of any kind.

Such is the view which Lord Clarendon, himself the intimate friend and admirer of this amiable nobleman, has given of Falkland's political character. In the main we believe it to be correct, although, as might have been expected, the historian of 'the great rebellion,' has dexterously thrown the well-known attachment of the viscount to constitutional principles as much into the shade as possible, while he has reflected a strong light on such features of his friend's character as tended most to identify him with his own party and principles. It would be difficult however to select from the pages of any historian a more finished sketch of individual biography than that which Clarendon has devoted to the memory of Falkland. We shall pursue our sketch in the historian's own words.

"He had a courage of the most clear and keen temper, and so far from fear that he seemed not without some appetite of danger, and therefore upon any occasion of action he always engaged his person in those troops which he thought by the forwardness of the commanders to be most like to be farthest engaged; and in all such encounters he had about him an extraordinary cheerfulness, without at all affecting the execution that usually attended them, in which he took no delight, but took pains to prevent it, where it was not by resistance made necessary; insomuch that at Edge-hill, when the enemy was routed, he was like to have incurred great peril by interposing to save those who had thrown away their arms, and against whom it may be others were more fierce for their having thrown them away; so that a man might think he came into the field chiefly out of curiosity to see the face of danger, and charity to prevent the shedding of blood. Yet in his natural inclination he acknowledged he was addicted to the profession of a soldier, and shortly after he came to his fortune, before he was of age, he went into the Low Countries, with a resolution of procuring command, and to give himself up to it, from which he was diverted by the complete inactivity of that summer; so he returned into England, and shortly after entered upon that vehement course of study we mentioned before, till the first alarm from the north: then again he made ready for the field, and though he received some repulse in the command of a troop of horse of which he had a promise, he went a volunteer with the earl of Essex.

"From the entrance into this unnatural war his natural cheerfulness and vivacity grew clouded, and a kind of sadness and dejection of spirit stole upon him, which he had never been used to; yet, being one of those who believed that one battle would end all differences, and that there would be so great a victory on one side that the other would be compelled to submit to any conditions of the victor (which supposition and conclusion generally sunk into the minds of most men and prevented the looking after many advantages that might have been laid hold of) he resisted those indispositions, *et in luctu, bellum inter remedia erat*. But after the king's return from Brentford, and the furious resolution of the two houses not to admit any treaty for peace, those indispositions which had before touched him grew into a perfect habit of uncheerfulness, and he who had been so exactly easy and affable to all men that his face and countenance was always present, and vacant to his company, and held any cloudiness and less pleasantness of the visage a kind of rudeness or incivility, became on a sudden less communicable, and

thence, very sad, pale, and exceedingly affected with the spleen. In his clothes and habit, which he had minded before always with more neatness and industry, and expence, than is usual to so great a soul, he was not now only incurious, but too negligent; and in his reception of suitors, and the necessary or casual addresses to his place, so quick, and sharp, and severe, that there wanted not some men, strangers to his nature and disposition, who believed him proud and imperious, from which no mortal man was ever more free.

"It is true that as he was of a most incomparable gentleness, application, and even submission, to good, and worthy, and entire men, so he was naturally (which not but be more evident in his place, which subjected him to another conversation and intermixture than his own election would have done) *adversus malos injucundus*, and was so ill a dissembler of his dislike and disinclination to ill men that it was not possible for such not to discern it. There was once in the house of commons such a declared acceptance of the good service an eminent member had done to them, and, as they said, to the whole kingdom, that it was moved, he being present, that the speaker might, in the name of the whole house, give him thanks; and then that every member might, as a testimony of his particular acknowledgment, stir, or move his hat towards him; the which, though not ordered, when very many did, the Lord Falkland, who believed the service itself not to be of that moment, and that an honourable and generous person could not have stooped to it for any recompense, instead of moving his hat, stretched both his arms out, and clasped his hands together upon the crown of his hat, and held it close down to his head, that all men might see how odious that flattery was to him, and the very approbation of the person, though at that time the most popular.

"When there was any overture or hope of peace, he would be more erect and vigorous, and exceedingly solicitous to press any thing which he thought might promote it; and, sitting among his friends, often, after a deep silence, and frequent sighs, would with a shrill and sad accent, ingeminate the word *peace, peace*, and would passionately profess that the very agony of the war, and the view of the calamities and desolation of the kingdom did and must endure, took his sleep from him, and would shortly break his heart. This made some think, or pretend to think, that he was so much enamoured on peace that he would have been glad the king should have bought it at any price, which was a most unreasonable calumny; as if a man that was himself the most punctual and precise in every circumstance that might reflect upon conscience or honour could have wished the king to have committed a trespass against either. And yet this senseless scandal made some impression upon him, or at least he used it for an excuse of his daringness of spirit; for at the leaguer before Gloucester, when his friends passionately reprehended him for exposing his person unnecessarily to danger (for he delighted to visit the trenches and nearest approaches and to discover what the enemy did) as being so much beside the duty of his place that it might be understood rather to be against it, he would say merrily that his office could not take away the privilege of his age, and that a secretary in war might be present at the greatest scene of danger; but withal alleged seriously that it concerned him to be more active in enterprizes of hazard than other men, that all

might see that his impatience for peace proceeded not from pusillanimity, or fear to adventure his own person.

"In the morning before the battle, as always upon action, he was very cheerful, and put himself in the first rank of the Lord Byron's regiment, then advancing upon the enemy, who had lined the hedges on both sides with musqueteers, from whence he was shot with a musquet in the lower part of the belly, and, in the instant falling from his horse, his body was not found till the next morning, till when there was some hope he might have been taken prisoner, though his nearest friends, who knew his temper, received small comfort from that imagination. Thus fell that incomparable young man, in the four and thirtieth year of his age, having so much despatched the true business of life that the eldest rarely attain to that immense knowledge, and the youngest enter not into the world with more innocence. Whosoever leads such a life needs to be less anxious upon how short warning it is taken from him."

We are informed that Falkland was low in stature "and smaller than most men; his motion not graceful, and his aspect so far from inviting that it had somewhat in it of simplicity." His voice was harsh, and his whole appearance more repulsive than inviting. Yet within so forbidding an exterior dwelt one of the most amiable, accomplished, and high-toned spirits of the proudest day of England's history. There is a curious anecdote recorded of him and the sovereign to whose cause he sacrificed his life. It is said that whilst he was with Charles at Oxford, he accompanied his majesty one day to the Bodleian library, where, among other bibliographical curiosities, they were shown a very splendid edition of Virgil. While examining the volume, Falkland, to divert the king, proposed that he should try the *Sortes Virgilianæ*, a well known species of divination in use amongst scholars. The king complying, opened the volume at random, and alighted upon the well-known lines in Dido's imprecation, thus translated by Dryden :

" Oppress'd with numbers in the unequal field,
His men discouraged, and himself expell'd,
Let him for succour sue from place to place,
Torn from his subjects, and his son's embrace."

The king, it is said, was not a little disconcerted at the omen; whereupon Falkland tried the *sortes* himself, but received an equally ominous response. The passage which he turned up was that in which Evander thus laments the untimely death of his son Pallas :

" O Pallas! thou hast failed thy plighted word,
To fight with caution, not to tempt the sword:
I warn'd thee, but in vain, for well I knew
What peril youthful ardour would pursue;
That boiling blood would carry thee too far,
Young, as thou wert, in dangers, raw to war.
O curst essay of arms! disastrous doom!
Prelude of bloody fields and fights to come!"

Lord Falkland wrote and published a number of political and some polemical tracts. Among the former were: 'A speech on ill-counsellors about the king;' 'A speech against the lord-keeper Finch and the Judges;' 'A speech against the Bishops.' Among the latter, 'A discourse on the infallibility of the church of Rome.' Bishop Barlow informs us that he assisted Chillingworth in his 'Religion of Protestants.'

There is a memoir of the viscountess Falkland in Gibbon's 'Memoirs of Pious Women.' His son Henry Lucius inherited a considerable portion of his father's talents and reputation.

Spencer, Earl of Sunderland.

BORN A. D. 1620.—DIED A. D. 1643.

THIS amiable young nobleman was the eldest son of William, second Lord Spencer, by Penelope, daughter of the earl of Southampton. He was born at Althorpe, in Northamptonshire, in 1620. He completed his education at Magdalene college, Oxford. On the death of his father, in 1636, he succeeded to an immense estate. In 1639 he married Lady Dorothy Sidney, the celebrated Sacharissa of Waller, daughter of the earl of Leicester. On taking his seat in the house of peers he espoused the popular side at first, and was almost immediately appointed lord-lieutenant of his native county. When, however, the dissensions between the king and his subjects came to an open rupture, Spencer followed Charles to York. The principles and feelings which determined him to espouse the royal cause may be gathered from a few letters written by him to his lady, preserved in Collins' collection. In one of these he says: "The king's condition is much improved of late. His force increaseth daily, which increaseth the insolence of the papists. How much I am unsatisfied with the proceedings here, I have at large expressed in several letters; neither is there wanting daylie handsome occasion to retire, were it not for gaining honour; for let occasion be never so handsome, unless a man resolve to fight on the parliament side—which, for my part, I had rather be hanged—it will be said a man is afraid to fight. If there could be an expedient found to salve the punctilio of honour, I would not continue here an hour. The discontent that I, and many other honest men, receive daily, is beyond expression." In another letter, he complains of the folly of the catholic party in opposing any attempt at accommodation with the parliament, and expresses his determination to give such a treaty his utmost support.

On the 8th of June, 1643, the king rewarded the gallantry which he had displayed in the battle of Edgehill by advancing him to the dignity of earl of Sunderland. Soon after he writes to his wife from before Gloucester, "Many of the soldiers are confident that we shall have the town within this four days, which I extremely long for; not that I am weary of this siege, for really, though we suffer many inconveniences, yet I am not ill-pleased with this variety, so directly opposite as the being in the trenches, with so much good company, together with the noise and tintamarre of guns and drums, with the horrid spectacles and hideous cries of dead and hurt men, as to the solitariness of my quarter, together with all the markes of peace, which often brings into my thoughts, notwithstanding your mother's opinion of me, how infinitely more happy I should esteem myself quietly to enjoy your company at Althorp, than to be troubled with the noise and engaged in the factions of the court, which I shall ever endeavour to avoid." On the 20th of September, 1643, this excellent youth was mortally wounded by a cannon-bullet in the battle of Newbury.

George, Lord Goring.

DIED A. D. 1645.

SIR GEORGE GORING of Hurst-Pierrepont, in Sussex, was, in early life, the friend and companion of Henry, prince of Wales. In 1629, he was created Lord Goring, and in 1645 was advanced to the title of earl of Norwich, which had then become extinct by the death of his maternal uncle, Edward Denny.

Sir George married when very young, and appears to have been of extremely imprudent habits, if not of dissolute morals also. Wentworth, in a letter dated 20th of May, 1633, says, "Young Mr Goring is gone to travel, having run himself out of £8,000, which he purposes to redeem by his frugality abroad, unless my lord of Cork, (his father-in-law) can be induced to put to his helping hand, which I have undertaken to solicit for him the best I can." Soon after his arrival on the continent he took up the profession of arms, and, through the influence of his friends, obtained the command of Lord Vere's regiment in the Low Countries. In this command he greatly distinguished himself, and was present at the siege of Breda, where he was severely wounded in 1637.

In 1641, we find him governor of Portsmouth, then the strongest and best-fortified place in England. In this situation he contrived for a length of time to act a singularly deceitful and double part. He was one of the first to advise Charles to march the army upon London, in order to overawe the country-party, and was the first also to disclose the whole scheme to the indignant commons. Deceived by his protestations, and anxious to secure the services of a man of so much military experience, the parliament raised him to the rank of lieutenant-general of their forces, and appointed him to organise and discipline the new levies. He did not indeed accept the commission, but he pleaded in excuse the necessity of his giving his personal superintendence to the construction of some new fortifications at Portsmouth. In November, 1641, he was summoned before the house, and required to explain some suspicious circumstances in his recent conduct. Sir Edward Nicholas, in a letter to the king, thus notices the circumstance:—"Col. Goring gave the house of commons good satisfaction, Saturday last, touching his fidelity and good affections, and was therefore dismissed." He was, however, secretly preparing to throw off the mask; but in the meantime he proved himself a perfect adept in the art of dissimulation. "He could help himself," says Clarendon, "with all the insinuations of doubt, or fear, or shame, or simplicity, in his face, that might gain belief to a greater degree than I ever saw any man; and could seem the most confounded when he was best prepared, and the most out of countenance when he was best resolved; and to want words, and the habit of speaking, when they flowed from no man with greater power."—At length he received a peremptory order to join the army, and unable any longer to avoid disclosing his real sentiments, he returned for answer that he could not on honour quit his command without the royal permission. In a few days, Portsmouth was invested by the parliamentary forces. This was the first step in

the civil war. The king immediately proclaimed Essex and the officers under him traitors, unless they should return to their duty within the space of six days, and the two houses declared the proclamation a libellous and scandalous paper.

With the inconsistency which marked his whole actions, Goring made no defence, but capitulated on the single condition that he should be allowed to transport himself beyond the seas. In 1644, he again returned to England, and obtained a command in the marquess of Newcastle's army. Soon after, he superseded Lord Wilmot, as general of the horse under Rupert. In the winter of the following year he was made lieutenant-general of Hampshire, Sussex, Surrey, and Kent; but his conduct did great injury to the king's cause. The fact is, Goring was now a thoroughly demoralized man, with none of the qualities of a military commander but that of mere animal courage. The example of his loose and licentious habits soon infected the soldiery under his command. At Salisbury, Clarendon tells us, "his horse committed the same horrible outrages and barbarities as they had done in Hampshire, without distinction of friends or foes, so that those parts which before were well-devoted to the king, worried by oppression, wished for the access of any troops to redeem them." Equally unsatisfactory was the result of most of his military enterprises. He failed to reduce Weymouth; he declined to undertake the siege of Taunton; and he omitted several favourable opportunities of giving battle to Sir William Waller, in Somersetshire. It is difficult to account for the influence which, notwithstanding these signal and repeated failures and gross misconduct, he contrived to exercise with both Charles and the prince. On the 10th of May, 1645, he was admitted to the council of the latter, and invested with almost absolute military powers. In this situation his conduct was marked by the most inordinate ambition, by insolence, and by imbecility. He did some good service at Taunton, but neutralized it all by the gross errors which he almost immediately afterwards fell into. Routed by Fairfax at Bridgewater, he refused to march with the remains of his horse to join the king at Newark, and suddenly solicited the prince's permission to visit France for a time. Nor did he wait for the permission thus solicited, but hastily transported himself to the continent, whence he never returned. What became of him afterwards is not very distinctly known. Dugdale informs us that he obtained a lieutenant-general's commission in Spain, but being corrupted by Cardinal Mazarine, he was seized at the head of his troops, and sent prisoner to Madrid, where he was soon after put to death for treason.

Edward, Lord Herbert.

BORN A. D. 1581.—DIED A. D. 1648.

EDWARD HERBERT, commonly called Lord Herbert of Cherbury, was the eldest son of Sir Richard Herbert, a gentleman of very ancient family. He was born at his father's seat, Montgomery castle, in Wales, in 1581. At the early age of twelve, he was sent to the university of Oxford. At the age of fifteen he married an heiress of his own

name and blood, the daughter of Sir William Herbert of St Gillian's. The lady was six years older than her youthful husband, but as her father had bequeathed the family-estate to her on the express condition that she should marry a Herbert, and Edward was the only one of the race who could make her a fitting match, she consented to receive the boy-husband, and kindly remained with him at Oxford until he had completed his studies. In 1600, he came to London, and obtained a favourable introduction to the queen. "Curiosity," says he, "rather than ambition brought me to court; and, as it was the manner of these times for all men to kneel down before the great Queen Elizabeth, who then reigned, I was likewise upon my knees in the presence-chamber, when she passed by to the chapel at Whitehall. As soon as she saw me, she stopped, and, swearing her usual oath, demanded 'Who is this?' Every body there present looked upon me, but no man knew me, till Sir James Croft, a pensioner, finding the queen stayed, returned back, and told who I was, and that I had married Sir William Herbert of St Gillian's daughter. The queen looked attentively upon me, and, swearing again her ordinary oath, said, 'It is pity he was married so young!' and, thereupon, gave her hand to kiss twice, both times gently clapping me on the cheek."

At James's coronation, Herbert was made a knight of the bath. The customary oath, taken on admission to this order, to redress the wrongs of "all ladies and gentlemen" working upon his fervid imagination, soon plunged him into a series of adventures unmatched since the days of chivalry. A French cavalier having snatched a favour from the bonnet of a young lady, the damsel applied to Sir Herbert for redress, who instantly took up her cause, and compelled the Frenchman to restore the ribband. Ten years afterwards, having met with the same uncourteous cavalier, he reminded him of his offence, and challenged him to mortal combat, if he should dare to deny the fact of his chastisement. In his autobiography he gives us an account of five or six of his offers of combat made on occasion of offences, real or imaginary, sustained by him or his friends. In 1608, he set out to make the tour of the continent alone. He spent some time at Paris, where he was greatly flattered by the queen. In 1610, he joined the English troops under Sir Edward Cecil, then employed by the prince of Orange in the siege of Juliers. On this occasion, a French officer in the same service, having dared him to an exploit of courage, the two sprung together out of the trenches, and rushed forward, sword in hand, to the opposite bulwark, from which, our knight informs us, he was the last to retire. Both escaped unhurt, and Sir Edward was afterwards the first to cross the ditch before the wall of the beleaguered city. "And now," adds our hero, "if I may say it without vanity, I was in great esteem both in court and city, many of the greatest desiring my company, though yet, before that time, I had no acquaintance with them. Richard, earl of Dorset, to whom otherwise I was a stranger, one day invited me to Dorset-house, where, bringing me into his gallery, and showing me many pictures, he at last brought me to a frame covered with green taffeta, and asked me who I thought was there, and there-withal, presently drawing the curtain, showed me my own picture; whereupon, demanding how his lordship came to have it, he answered that he had heard so many brave stories of me, that he got a copy of a picture

which one Larking, a painter, drew for me. . . . But not only the earl of Dorset, but a greater person than I will here nominate, got another copy from Larking, and, placing it afterwards in his cabinet (without that ever I knew such a thing was done,) gave occasion, to those that saw it after his death, of more discourse than I could have wished." This greater person was undoubtedly the queen; to whom also the following very remarkable passage must refer:—"And now in court a great person sent for me divers times to attend her, which summons, though I obeyed, yet, God knoweth, I declined coming to her as much as conveniently I could, without incurring her displeasure: and this I did, not only for very honest reasons, but, to speak ingeniously, because that affection passed between me and another lady (who, I believe, was the fairest of her time), as nothing could divert it."

In 1614, he again went abroad, and served some time under the prince of Orange. Two years afterwards he was sent as ambassador to the French court. On this occasion he quarrelled with the constable of France, and was called home. Lloyd informs us that "he fell on his knees to King James, before the duke of Buckingham, to have a trumpeter, if not a herald, sent to Monsieur Lesignes (the constable), to tell him that he had made a false relation of the passages betwixt him and Sir Edward Herbert, and that Sir Edward would demand reason of him with sword in hand."

While in Paris he published his celebrated treatise '*De Veritate*,' the object of which was to defend the sufficiency of natural religion,—“not so much to impugn the doctrine or morality of the Scriptures, as to attempt to supersede their necessity, by endcavouring to show that the great principles of the unity of God, a moral government, and a future world, are taught with sufficient clearness by the light of nature.”¹

Few other circumstances of his life are on record. He was raised to the Irish peerage in 1625, and afterwards created an English baron by the title of Lord Herbert of Cherbury. He espoused the parliamentary side in the civil war, and had his castle demolished by the king's troops. He died in London in 1648.

Among the productions of his pen is a history of the reign of Henry VIII., of which Bishop Nicholson says, "the author has acquitted himself with the like reputation as Lord-chancellor Bacon gained by the life of Henry VII., having, in the politic and martial parts, been remarkably exact from the best records that remain." His autobiography was edited by Horace, earl of Orford.

James, Earl of Derby.

DIED A. D. 1651.

JAMES, seventh earl of Derby, was the eldest son of William, the sixth earl, by Elizabeth, daughter of Edward Vere, earl of Oxford. Of his early life nothing is known. He first appears in the history of his country in 1628, when he was summoned to parliament by the title of Lord Strange. He does not appear to have engaged deeply in political life at this period. He had married in early life Charlotte De

¹ Hall's Sermon on Infidelity.

la Tremouille, daughter of Claude, duke of Thouars; and with her he lived chiefly in happy retirement upon his ample estates. The death of his father enlarged his fortune and influence, but the approach of the civil war quickly plunged him into all the difficulties and dangers of that crisis.

When the king retired to York, in the beginning of 1642, Derby was one of the first nobles who hastened to join him, and was immediately employed in rallying the forces of Lancashire around the royal standard. His exertions were at first eminently successful. Upwards of 60,000 men appeared at the different musters for the king's cause; but disaffection soon thinned their ranks, and in a short time a large proportion of this force had either retired to their homes or joined the opposite party. The earl, however, raised three regiments of foot, and as many troops of horse, from among his own tenantry, and clothed and armed them at his own cost. These exertions were thrown away on his ungrateful and infatuated sovereign, who allowed designing and selfish men to exclude Derby from those offices of trust and personal service to which he was so well entitled, while at the same time, he continued to employ him in raising fresh forces wherever his name and influence extended. These were no sooner mustered than they were draughted off to the main army, while the earl himself was left without an adequate force to garrison even his own mansion at Lathom.

While preparing for a siege here, the earl received notice that an expedition had been planned against his little sovereignty of Man. Anxious to preserve this island as a place of retreat for his sovereign in extremity, he instantly sailed thither, leaving his lady in charge of the mansion-house at Lathom. The countess acquitted herself most gallantly in her perilous trust. Fairfax approached with the intention of seizing Lathom, but was surprised to find its gates shut against him. He offered the countess a safe and honourable removal to the Familyse at Knowsley park, but she rejected his conditions, and declared that she would defend the place while life remained to her. The siege was then commenced in form; but so vigorously and skilfully did the gallant countess and her little garrison defend themselves, that at the end of three months the royal standard still floated over Lathom, and 2000 of the besiegers lay buried before its walls. The return of the earl compelled the assailants to break up the siege on the 27th of May, 1644.

The earl and his countess soon after this retired to the isle of Man, which they held out for their monarch even after the death of the first Charles. He remained here till 1651, when, at the summons of the younger Charles, he again appeared in Lancashire for the purpose of raising troops for the king's service. Nothing could be more hopeless than the enterprise in which Charles was now engaged; but Derby's loyalty knew no faltering. It was of that lofty kind which was ever ready to suffer all things rather than sacrifice its allegiance. At Wigan, Derby's party was unexpectedly set upon by Lilburn, and nearly the whole of them cut to pieces in the street. The earl himself escaped almost singly, after having had two horses shot under him, and having received seven shot in his breast-plate. After the fatal 3d of September, Derby having provided for the king's concealment, attempted to regain his own country, but was apprehended on the borders of Cheshire, and led a prisoner to Chester.

Parliament sent down a commission to nineteen military officers, 'to try the earl of Derby for his treason and rebellion.' By this tribunal he was found guilty, and adjudged to be beheaded at his own house of Bolton-le-moors. The sentence was carried into effect on the 15th of October, 1651. The following is from a narrative by Bagaley, one of the earl's gentlemen, printed in Collins' peerage: On mounting the scaffold, his lordship "called for the headsman, and asked to see the axe, saying, 'Come friend, give it me into my hand, I'll neither hurt it nor thee, and it cannot hurt me, I am not afraid of it;' but kissed it and so gave it to the headsman again. Then asked for the block, which was not ready, and turned his eyes and said, 'How long, Lord, how long?' Then, putting his hand into his pocket, gave him two pieces of gold, saying, 'This is all I have, take it, and do thy work well, and when I am upon the block and lift up my hand, then do you your work; but I doubt your coat is too burly, (being of great black shag,) it will hinder you or trouble you.' Some standing by bid him ask his lordship's forgiveness, but he was either too sullen or too slow, for his lordship forgave him before he asked him. And so passing to the other end of the scaffold, where his coffin lay, spying one of his chaplains on horseback, among the troopers, said, 'Sir, remember me to your brothers and friends; you see I am ready, and the block is not ready, but when I am got into my chamber, as I shall not be long out of it, (pointing to his coffin,) I shall be at rest, and not troubled with such a guard and noise as I have been;' and so turning himself again, he saw the block, and asked if it was ready; and so going to the place where he began his speech, said, 'Good people, I thank you for your prayers and for your tears; I have heard the one and seen the other, and our God sees and hears both. Now, the God of heaven bless you all. Amen.' And so having turned himself towards the block, and then looking towards the church, his lordship caused the block to be turned and laid that ways, saying, 'I will look towards the sanctuary which is above for ever.' Then, having his doublet off, he asked, 'How must I lie? will any one shew me? I never yet saw any man's head cut off, but I will try how it fits: and so laying himself down, and stretching himself upon it, he rose again and caused it to be a little removed; and standing up, and looking towards the headsman, said, 'Remember what I told you; when I lift up my hands, then do your work.'

"And at his friends about him bowing, said, 'The Lord be with you all: pray for me:' and so kneeling on his knees, made a short and private prayer, ending with the Lord's prayer. And so bowing himself again, said, 'The Lord bless my wife and children: the Lord bless us all.' So, laying his neck upon the block, and his arms stretched out, he said these words aloud:

Blessed be God's glorious name for ever and ever. Amen.

Let the whole earth be filled with his glory. Amen.

And then lifting up his hands, was ready to give up the ghost, but the executioner, not well observing, was too slow, so his lordship rose again, saying to the headsman, 'What have I done that I die not? Why do not you your work? Well, I will lay myself down once again in peace, and I hope I shall enjoy everlasting peace.' So he laid himself down again, with his neck to the block, and his arms stretched out, saying the same words

Blessed be God's glorious name for ever and ever. Amen.

Let the whole earth be filled with his glory. Amen.'

And lifting up his hands, the executioner did his work, and no manner of noise was then heard but sighs and sobs."

"The earl of Derby," says Clarendon, "was a man of unquestionable loyalty to the late king, and gave clear testimony of it before he received any obligations from the court, and when he thought himself obliged by it. This king, in his first year, sent him the garter, which, in many respects, he had expected from the last. And the sense of that honour made him so readily comply with the king's command, in attending him, when he had no confidence in the undertaking, nor any inclination to the Scots, who, he thought, had too much guilt upon them, in having depressed the crown, to be made instruments of repairing and restoring it. He was a man of great honour, and clear courage; and all his defects and misfortunes proceeded from his having lived so little time among his equals that he knew not how to treat his inferiors, which was the source of all the ill that befell him; having thereby drawn such prejudice against him from persons of inferior quality, who yet thought themselves too good to be contemned, that they pursued him to death."

The earl's heroic countess, after the surrender of the Isle of Man, led a life of considerable hardship and adventure for some time. At the restoration, the family estates reverted to her eldest son, and he spent his few remaining days at Knowsley park. He died in 1652.

Henry Ireton.

DIED A. D. 1651.

HENRY IRETON, one of the most distinguished statesmen and generals of the commonwealth of England, was the eldest son of German Ireton, Esq. of Attington in Nottinghamshire. The date of his birth is not mentioned in any of the biographies, but it probably was somewhere between 1608 and 1610. This we infer from the fact of his leaving the university of Oxford in 1629, after having taken the degree of B. A., as a gentleman commoner of Trinity college. Upon leaving the university he studied the law in the Middle temple in conjunction with John Lambert, who also became subsequently a distinguished officer in the parliamentary army. It appears that Ireton had continued in the legal profession at least twelve or thirteen years before he changed it for that of arms. Having entered into the service of the parliament he was promoted gradually from the rank of captain to that of commissary-general. These advances were probably facilitated by his interest with Cromwell, having married his daughter Bridget, but, no doubt, were chiefly owing to his eminent abilities whether in the council or in the field. That he was a person of considerable influence at the commencement of the war may be inferred from the fact, that he was one of the seventy-five persons who undertook each to raise a troop of horse for the service of the parliament. His brother, Sir John Ireton, was also lord-mayor of London under the protectorate. He was first captain in the regiment of horse commanded by Algernon Sidney,

who was much younger than himself; but his rise from this period was exceedingly rapid. He gained the confidence of Cromwell to a very high degree, and is said to have had more influence over him than any other of his friends. Whitlock says, "he was very active and industrious, and of good abilities. He made much use of his pen, wherein his having been bred a lawyer was a help to him." At the battle of Naseby, Ireton took the command of the left wing by the special desire of Cromwell. The attack upon this wing, conducted by Prince Rupert, was so furious, that it was for a time driven back, and Ireton himself, having received two wounds, was made prisoner; but in the sequel of the battle made his escape. From this period Ireton took an active part in all the affairs of the parliament, and is said to have drawn up the famous Remonstrance in behalf of the army. Most of the papers emanating from the army, as well as Lord Fairfax's letters to the parliament, are attributed to his pen. He was also employed in drawing up the instrument for the king's trial, and sat as one of his judges.

In 1649 the rump parliament made Ireton major-general to Cromwell in his Irish expedition. After Cromwell returned to England he committed the conduct of affairs to Ireton, who completely reduced that kingdom to the authority of the parliament. But Ireton fell a sacrifice to his zeal in the public cause. He suffered great fatigue in conducting the siege of Limerick, and after having taken the place, was seized by the plague, and died Nov. 1651. His body was brought to Westminster, and buried in Henry VII.'s chapel with great pomp. But after the restoration the body was disinterred, drawn to Tyburn on a sledge, then hung upon a gallows, and afterwards buried under it in a pit with others.

Mrs Hutchinson, in the memoirs of her husband, speaks of the high esteem which the colonel bore to Ireton, and of his entire confidence in his judgment. Ludlow, also—who viewed him in a post of great power and great temptation, that of deputy of Ireland, being next in command—gives the following account of his conduct in one instance which will speak much for the generous and patriotic feelings which animated all his conduct: "The parliament ordered an act to be brought in for settling £2,000 per annum on the lord-deputy Ireton, the news of which being brought over was so unacceptable to him, that he said they had many just debts, which he desired they would pay before they made any such presents; that he had no need of their land, and would not have it; and that he should be more contented to see them doing the service of the nation, than so liberal in disposing of the public treasure."

The character of Ireton has been traduced by Clarendon and such like party-writers, in the most shameful manner, but their charges are all vague and general, and many of them utterly without foundation. The firm, sober, and resolved character of Ireton made him many enemies. The royalists considered him as their most formidable adversary; and the advocates of license hated as much as they feared him.—His character is thus delineated by Cooke, chief-justice of Munster, his special and particular friend: "Never had commonwealth a greater loss, because undoubtedly there never was a more able, painful, provident, and industrious servant. He discharged his duty to all people, and acted every part so well, as if he had been born only for that particular. He was a patron, father, and husband to the fatherless and widow. For

uprightness, single-heartedness, and sincerity, he exercised them to his enemies; and, though he was very sparing of his promises to the rebels, yet was he more liberal in his performances. He was a most exact justiciary in all matters of moral righteousness, and with strength of solid reason had a most piercing judgment and a large understanding. He was willing to hear truth from the meanest soldier. For so great a stock of knowledge, such extraordinary abilities in matters of learning, military, judicial, political, mathematical, moral, rational, and divine,—I say, for every thing requisite and desirable, both as a man and a Christian, I think it will be hard with many candles to find his equal. I believe few men knew more of the art of policy and self-interested pruden-
tials, but never man so little practised them. If he erred in any thing, (as error and humanity are inseparable,) it was in too much neglecting himself, seldom thinking it time to eat till he had done the work of the day, at nine or ten at night; and then would sit up as long as any man had business with him. Indeed, he was every thing from a foot-soldier to a general. He is and shall be most dear to my remembrance; and, of all the saints I ever knew, I desire to make him my precedent.”¹

Digby, Earl of Bristol.

BORN A. D. 1580.—DIED A. D. 1653.

JOHN DIGBY, by no means an inconsiderable man in his day, was the fourth son of Sir George Digby of Coleshill, in Warwickshire. He entered Magdalen college, Oxford, in 1595. After completing his education at Oxford, he passed two or three years in France and Italy. After his return to England, happening to be in Warwickshire when Catesby's band made their mad attempt to carry off the princess Elizabeth, he was sent to court by Lord Harrington with the intelligence of that enterprise, and its defeat,—a mission in which he acquitted himself so well that James, taking a fancy to him, appointed him gentleman of the privy-chamber, and in the following February conferred on him the honour of knighthood,

In 1611, he was sent ambassador to Spain, and again in 1614. In the course of these missions, he discovered that the earl of Somerset was in the pay of the Spanish ministry, and reported the fact to his sovereign. But James was both too partial and too timid to punish the favourite for an offence in which so many of his courtiers and ministers notoriously participated, and the matter was hushed. The ambassador's fidelity, however, was rewarded by a new embassy to Spain for the purpose of treating for the hand of the infanta, and he acquitted himself so much to James's satisfaction on this occasion also, that he conferred on him the dignity of a baron, by the title of Lord Digby of Sherborne. After an intervening embassy to the German States, he was despatched a fourth time to Spain, in company with Sir Walter Aston, in 1622. Various obstacles had sprung up to impede James's favourite project for an alliance between his son Charles and the infanta,

¹ Godwin's Commonwealth.—Collier.—Whitlock.

Maria. The same year he was created earl of Bristol. During his absence, the favourite Buckingham sought in vain to shake the king's confidence in him; and, on finding the task a more difficult one than he had at first anticipated, he employed various arts and threats to prevent his return to England. But the earl was not to be intimidated, and, in spite of Buckingham's threats, hastened home to obtain an audience with the king. Immediately on landing at Dover, he was committed to the Tower by the favourite's order; but a committee of lords having pronounced him free of all matter of impeachment, he was soon after restored to liberty.

On the accession of Charles, the earl fell into disgrace at court, and in May, 1626, was impeached for high treason. But he boldly recriminated, by preparing articles of impeachment against Buckingham; and the king, to protect his favourite, was obliged to dissolve the parliament. For a time the earl sided with the leaders of opposition in the long parliament; but he at last withdrew into voluntary exile, and became a zealous adherent to the royal cause. He died at Paris on the 21st of January, 1653. He published some tracts, speeches, and verses, and, in the earlier part of his life, a translation of Peter du Moulin's 'Defence of the catholic faith.'

Admiral Blake.

BORN A. D. 1599.—DIED A. D. 1657.

THIS distinguished English admiral was the son of a respectable merchant at Bridgewater, in the county of Somerset. He was born in August, 1599, and received the rudiments of education at the grammar school of Bridgewater. At the age of sixteen he was entered of Alban's hall, Oxford. Wood informs us that the young collegian occasionally amused himself with hunting and stealing swans,—an offence probably of no great culpability in those times. In 1619, he stood for a fellowship in Merton college, but was rejected by the warden, Sir Henry Saville, on the extraordinary ground of not being of sufficient stature for holding such an academical distinction! Probably the religious principles of his family, which were known to lean to Presbyterianism, was the real ground of the warden's opposition to young Blake; but whatever occasioned his failure, he ultimately had no reason to regret the circumstance by which Providence seems to have given his professional views a totally new direction. He left the university in his 25th year, and took up his residence at Bridgewater, where he conducted himself with much prudence and discretion, so as to win general respect, while he openly professed his attachment to the nonconformist party and puritan principles. In the parliament which sat in April, 1640, he took his place as burgess for Bridgewater, an honour which he owed to the universal estimation in which he was held for integrity and independence of character. In the long parliament which succeeded he lost his election.

On the breaking out of the civil war, Blake unhesitatingly declared for the parliament, and raised a troop of dragoons, which he personally commanded. He was now in his fortieth year, and this was his first

essay in arms, yet he soon discovered remarkable military talents, and the most indomitable courage in the field. At the siege of Bristol he was intrusted with the defence of a small fort on the lines, from which he continued to fire upon the royalists even after the surrender of the city by the officer in command, who had neglected to give him notice of the capitulation.¹ He subsequently served in Somersetshire, and made a most successful defence of Lyme against Prince Maurice. In 1644, he was appointed governor of Taunton, the only place held by the parliament on that side of the island. Here he was besieged by Goring; and though the town was but poorly fortified, and few supplies could be thrown in, yet he made a most spirited and successful defence, and refused to surrender the castle even after the royalists had made a breach on the defences, and were actually in possession of a part of the town. The assailants repeatedly pressed him to surrender, but he scouted the idea, and declared that he would eat his boots first. At last, the royalists were compelled to raise the siege, after they had lost 1000 men before and in the town. Another attempt, however, was soon afterwards made upon Taunton by the united forces of Lord Goring, Sir Richard Greenville, and Colonel Berkeley. The besieged were sorely straitened this time, but their heroic governor resolutely held out till relieved by the approach of Fairfax and Massey. Blake's successful defence of Taunton materially contributed to the final defeat of the royal cause; for the king, knowing well the importance of the place, was induced to employ a considerable portion of his forces in the attempt to reduce it, and consequently took the field at Naseby with a force considerably inferior to what he might otherwise have brought into that decisive action. It appears that when the trial of the king was finally determined on, amongst other precautionary measures, a part of the troops under Blake was disbanded. He was well known to disapprove of the more violent measures of the army, and to have leaned strongly to the side of mercy. This humane disposition, added to the high and generous feelings of his nature which raised him to an immeasurable height above mere partisanship, obtained for him the respect both of the republicans and royalists, while it kept him from taking any very active part in the perplexed and conflicting politics of the day. But Cromwell, while he reckoned him unfit or rather unsuitable for the council-board, was too quick-eyed and good a soldier himself not to know the worth and value of his man; and, accordingly, he soon found a sphere in which so highly gifted a patriot might render his talents most available to his country.

On the 12th of February, 1649, Colonels Blake, Deane, and Popham, were appointed commissioners of the navy, and nominated to the command of squadrons. With our ideas of naval service, it seems a violent and unnatural transition to pass without any professional preparation, from the command of a regiment of soldiers to that of a line-of-battle ship; but strange as it may appear, it was nevertheless a common practice until towards the close of the second Charles' reign, and it succeeded so well, especially in the instance before us, as almost to justify and recommend such appointments. The truth seems to be that the naval tactics of that age were, compared at least with those of our own

¹ Howell's State Trials, p. 221.

day, exceedingly rude and simple; and the qualities of courage, decision, and promptitude, constituted nearly all the qualifications requisite for a naval command. These, we have seen, Blake possessed in an eminent degree; and to them he likewise added a quickness of apprehension and fertility of genius which enabled him to adapt himself with great readiness to new and extraordinary situations. His first service was to blockade the royal squadron, having the Princes Rupert and Maurice on board, in Kinsale harbour. He kept them in close durance from the end of February, 1649, until the following October, when, despairing of relief, the princes resolved to force their way through the blockading squadron, which they effected with the loss of three of their ships, and steered for Lisbon, whither Blake followed them. On his arrival in the Tagus, he demanded the ships of Prince Rupert as belonging to the commonwealth of England. The requisition greatly embarrassed the Portuguese cabinet, but it was ultimately resolved to decline complying with it, and on Blake's attempting to force his way up the river to Rupert's anchorage, he was driven back by the fire from the batteries on shore. Blake, in junction with Popham, now made severe reprisals on the Portuguese merchant-men, until alarmed by the losses of his subjects, Don John compelled Rupert to quit the Tagus, and hastened to patch up a treaty with the commonwealth. From the Tagus, Rupert proceeded to Carthagená, and thence to Malaga, where he was inconsiderate enough to capture some English merchantmen. Informed of this transaction, Blake sailed immediately for Malaga, and having attacked the royal squadron, burnt or destroyed all but four or five ships, with which the two princes escaped to the West Indies. Prince Maurice, some time afterwards was cast away. Rupert got back to France, and sold his vessels and prizes, on behalf of Charles II., to the French government. Such was the fate of a fleet of twenty-five ships, which, on the execution of Charles I., had declared for his son.²

Returning home, Blake encountered a French ship of forty guns, the commander of which, not having been apprised of the commencement of hostilities between France and England, cheerfully accepted an invitation to come on board Admiral Blake's ship. On being informed of the war, and asked if he would willingly resign his sword, the spirited Frenchman returned an instant answer in the negative; whereupon Blake, with equal gallantry, allowed him to return to his vessel and defend himself as he best could, which he bravely did for two hours, and then surrendered. His next service was the reduction of the Scilly islands, and of Jersey and Guernsey. The maritime rivalry of the English and Dutch nations was now assuming a warlike attitude. The navigation act, by which it was ordered that no goods, the produce of Africa, Asia, or America, should be imported into Britain but in English bottoms, had been passed and carried into execution. By this act, the Dutch, who had hitherto been the common carriers of Europe, beheld themselves suddenly stripped of one of their most lucrative branches of commerce. In addition to this source of irritation, letters of marque had been granted to several individuals, on the representation of certain merchants who conceived themselves to have been injured by the

² Life of Prince Rupert.—Heath, 275.

Dutch navy, and numerous prizes had been brought into the English ports.³ To protect their commerce, the States equipped a powerful fleet; but, at the same time, sent an embassy to London to negotiate for the repeal of the navigation act, and the pacific adjustment of differences. The ambassadors were received with all outward demonstrations of respect; but, instead of having their proposition listened to, had a formal demand made upon them for the payment of a sum of £1,700,000, as a reparation for injuries inflicted by the Dutch on English merchants in Amboyna, Persia, Muscovy, Greenland, and other places. While the conferences were yet pending, a Dutch fleet of forty-five sail, under the celebrated Van Tromp, appeared in the Downs, and proceeded to take up an anchorage. Blake was immediately ordered to repair thither with such ships as were ready. When the English fleet appeared in sight, Van Tromp weighed anchor, and bore up without striking his flag,—an honour which had always been paid to England in the narrow seas. Blake reminded Van Tromp of his duty by firing a gun without ball, but the signal was scornfully answered by a single gun. Blake fired a second, and then a third gun, but Van Tromp cut the discussion short by pouring a broadside into the English admiral's vessel. A general fight ensued, which lasted from five o'clock until night. When the fleet separated, the English cut off two ships of thirty guns. It is now impossible to determine who was the aggressor in this first conflict betwixt the two rival naval powers. Van Tromp, in his official despatches, affirms that he backed his sails and lowered his flag to the British admiral, who nevertheless fired upon him; while Blake, on the other hand, states the contrary. Still the Dutch, unwilling to lose their fishing-trade and commercial advantages, manifested a strong desire to negotiate; but the demands of the commonwealth for complete and perfect indemnification were so inexorable and exorbitant, that all hopes of reconciliation vanished, and both parties prepared for a struggle. The fleet of Blake was rapidly reinforced through the exertions of Cromwell and Bond; and Van Tromp sailed from the Texel with seventy men of war. But the fleet of the latter was soon afterwards dispersed by a storm, and five of his vessels fell into the hands of the English. Returning to Holland, Van Tromp was received with reproaches by the populace, and, in consequence, resigned his commission, and was succeeded by De Ruyter and De Witt, who signally failed in their first action with Blake. Van Tromp was again prevailed upon to resume the command of the Dutch fleet. Blake was riding in the Downs with only thirty-seven sail, when he was surprised by the appearance of his old adversary, with a fleet of double that number; he, however, maintained an unequal contest for fourteen hours, and then ran up the Thames as far as Leigh. In about two months Blake was enabled to put to sea again, and sailed in search of his rival, whom he encountered returning up the channel from the isle of Rhé, with three hundred merchant ships under his convoy. A warm engagement followed, in which the Dutch lost eleven ships and thirty merchantmen. On the 2d of June, 1653, Van Tromp encountered the English squadron, under Monk and Deane, off the North Foreland. A sharp engagement ensued, which was resumed

³ Lingard.

next day. But Blake having been joined with eighteen fresh ships during the night, the Dutch were completely beaten, and only saved themselves by retiring among the flats and shallows of their own coast. The Dutch now attempted to resume negotiation; and the final defeat and death of their gallant admiral, Van Tromp, in an action with Monk, off the Texel, stimulated them to urge for peace, even at the expense of considerable concessions. At last a treaty was signed in April, 1654, on terms highly honourable to England.

In Cromwell's first parliament, which met in September, 1654, Blake was once more chosen to represent his native town of Bridgewater. But his services could not long be spared from other scenes. In the month of November, he was despatched, with a formidable fleet, to the Mediterranean, for the purpose of enforcing respect towards the English flag from the Barbary powers. In this object he so completely succeeded, that the Algerines released all their English prisoners without ransom, and the Tunisians, after having had their forts battered about their ears, and their shipping entirely destroyed, sued for peace on the most humble terms. Blake next proceeded to call several minor Christian powers to account for injuries inflicted on English commerce by them; among the rest, the knights of Malta were compelled to make reparation, and the duke of Tuscany to pay £60,000, in shape of compensation to English subjects. By such vigorous enterprises at sea, as well as by the consummate policy pursued in all negotiations with foreign states, the protector raised his country to the most enviable political preponderance amongst the states of Europe. On the capture of Jamaica, and the breaking out of the Spanish war, Blake scoured the Mediterranean, and inflicted a severe blow on the commerce of Spain.

The career of this distinguished officer was now drawing to a close. Dropsy and scurvy combined had already made dreadful ravages on his constitution, and, at his own suggestion, Admiral Montague had been appointed his colleague, to take charge of the fleet in the event of his decease at sea. The last service which he rendered his country was the destruction of a Spanish fleet, which had put into Santa Cruz. This was achieved in the face of very formidable obstacles,—so great, indeed, that the action has been censured by professional men as rash in the extreme. An incident which occurred in this engagement affords a fine specimen of the inflexible integrity and genuine patriotism of Blake. During the action, his brother, Captain Humphrey Blake, who commanded a ship for the first time, showed some symptoms of fear, which were observed by or reported to the admiral. The defaulter was immediately cashiered, and sent home, as unfit for fighting his country's battles. But while he thus sacrificed his private feelings to his sense of public duty, he continued to cherish towards his unfortunate brother the most fraternal feelings, and at his death bequeathed to him his paternal estate. After cruising some time before Cadiz, feeling his end approaching, he became anxious to return home, that he might at least expire on the soil which gave him birth. His desire, however, was denied him, for he breathed his last just as the fleet reached Plymouth sound. He died on board the *St George*, on the 17th of August, 1657. The protector and parliament evinced their high estimation of the man by affording him a magnificent public funeral.

With regard to the public and professional character of Blake, all

authorities are agreed that it was as nearly immaculate as humanity could be. From the moment of his entrance into public life, up to the day of his decease, he stood aloof from every thing like cabal and party-intrigue, and felt and acted as the servant of the commonwealth alone. In his own peculiar department he soon made himself without a rival either amongst his foes or his countrymen; he gave a new character to naval warfare, and it may be safely asserted that much of the past and present maritime superiority of Britain originated in the skill and bravery of Blake.

John Lilburne.

BORN A. D. 1618.—DIED A. D. 1657.

A PERSONAGE who occupies a remarkable place in the history of the English commonwealth, is John Lilburne. He has been happily called "the William Cobbett of the 17th century."¹ He was descended from an ancient family in the county-palatine of Durham, and was born at his father's seat at Thickney-Purcharden, in 1618. His elder brother, Robert, held a colonel's commission in the army of the parliament, and served with considerable distinction in the civil wars. Another brother, Henry, fell in the campaign of 1648. John, being a younger son, was designed for a trade, and, at the age of twelve years, was apprenticed to a draper in the city of London. His master, we are informed, was attached to the puritan party, and the apprentice enjoyed frequent opportunities of frequenting the sermons of the divines of that class, and perusing the numerous polemical and political publications which emanated from the body. When only nineteen years of age, he was introduced to the two celebrated pamphleteers, Prynne and Bastwick, then suffering imprisonment for the writing of libels. In young Lilburne these two enthusiastic politicians found an apt and ardent pupil. Entering fully into all their views, and especially their anti-prelatic sentiments, the youth volunteered to carry a piece which Bastwick had lately written against the bishops to Holland, for the purpose of getting it printed there. He despatched this commission with great alertness, and returned to England in a short time, bringing with him an edition of the 'Merry Liturgy,' as it was called, and several pieces of a similar kind, which he proceeded to disseminate secretly throughout the country. For this offence he was brought before the star-chamber, in 1638, and sentenced to be whipped, pilloried, imprisoned, and fined in £500. Nothing daunted by this sharp dealing, he underwent his sentence with all the spirit and constancy of a martyr. From the pillory he uttered many bold speeches against the bishops, and even dispersed his obnoxious pamphlets among the surrounding crowd. Being at length gagged, and thus prevented from giving audible expression to his sentiments, he manifested his indignation by stamping furiously with his feet.² The spirit he showed upon this occasion procured him the nick-name of 'free-born John,' from the royalists, while his own party hailed him with the appellation of saint. In prison he was at first load-

¹ Westminster Review, vol. viii. p. 342.

² Rushworth.

ed with double irons in one of the closest wards, but was afterwards treated with less harshness, and allowed a little more liberty. The first use which he made of this change in situation, was to publish a pamphlet of his own, entitled, 'The Christian Man's Trial,' which he followed up with 'Nine Arguments against Episcopacy,' and several 'Epistles to the Wardens of the Fleet.' Nothing daunted his courage or outwearied his perseverance; and, having the most perfect confidence in himself, and the soundness and justice of his principles, he persisted in the career on which he had entered with an unshrinking firmness of determination, which won for him the sympathy and respect of the more enlightened part of the community, and the applause and confidence of the populace.

In November, 1640, the parliament granted him the liberties of the Fleet; on the 3d of May, next year, he appeared at the head of the mob who demanded the execution of Strafford, and next day he was brought before the bar of the lords for an alleged assault upon Colonel Lumsford, the governor of the Tower. But the temper of the times favoured his acquittal, and, on the very same day, a vote was passed in the house of commons, declaring his former sentence illegal and tyrannical, and ordering that he should have reparation for his sufferings and losses. In the beginning of the civil wars, he held the commission of a captain of foot, and, being taken prisoner by the king's troops at Brentford, was conducted to Oxford and tried for high treason. He defended his conduct with dauntless intrepidity, but was only saved from execution by a declaration from the parliament, that, in case he suffered, a strict retaliation should be exacted upon the royalist prisoners then in their power. Soon after this, Lilburne attached himself to Cromwell's party, and obtained a majority of foot in King's regiment. King acted either an imbecile or a traitorous part at the siege of Newark, and Lilburne appeared his accuser. In consequence of this, the former was removed from all his employments, while Lilburne was rewarded with a lieutenant-colonelcy in Manchester's own regiment of dragoons, in which charge he conducted himself with singular bravery at Marston-moor.

When the scheme of an agreement of the people for placing the new constitution of England on the firmest basis was presented to parliament, in 1649, by the council of war, Lilburne violently opposed the measure. His favourite maxim was, that extraordinary cases did not require extraordinary remedies, and that the usual course of law and justice was equal to all emergencies. Hence he stoutly resisted the institution of a high court of justice, and declared that he saw no reason why the king should not be tried in the ordinary way, as well as any other man. The law, he contended, was plain and positive on this point: He that commits murder shall die. It did not say, except the murderer be a king, a queen, or a prince. The king, therefore, was as liable to the operation of the ordinary law as any other man, and ought, accordingly, to be tried by twelve sworn men.³ It was thought better to soothe the ever-restless demagogue at this critical juncture, and, if possible, to get him removed from the metropolis. Accordingly, the ordinance for granting him the sum of £3,000, by way of compensation for the unjust treatment he had received at the hands of the star-chamber, but which

³ Legal Fundamental Liberties.

had rather lingered in its progress through the house, was pushed through, and received the final sanction of both houses; and; immediately thereafter, Lilburne set out in pursuit of the compensation thus awarded him, which was to be raised from the estates of three delinquents, in the county of Durham. He, however, soon presented himself again in the metropolis. He had obtained only a small part of the sum awarded him; but money was nothing to him, compared with the delights of agitation and political brawling. His first experiments, on his return, were made upon the army, and such was his influence with them, that Fairfax could only interrupt his intrigues by forbidding all private meetings of officers or soldiers. Baffled in this quarter, the demagogue next presented himself at the bar of the commons with a plan of an agreement of the people, prepared according to his own ideas. Meeting with no encouragement at this hand, he next had recourse to the press, and published his protestation, under the title of 'England's New Chains Discovered.' This was soon followed by a 'Second Part,' which the house of commons voted seditious and scandalous, and, in consequence, Lilburne, and his coadjutors, William Walwyn, Thomas Prince, and Richard Overton, were sent to the Tower. It was much easier, however, to imprison the men themselves than to prevent the dissemination of their sentiments. A spirit of discontent and mutiny soon evidenced itself in the army, which showed that the seed sown by Lilburne had fallen upon congenial soil. To such a height had the spirit of insurrection risen among the soldiery, that one of them who was publicly shot in St Paul's church-yard for refusing to march upon his colonel's orders, received a splendid public funeral. One thousand soldiers went before the corpse, five or six in a file; then followed the corpse itself, with six trumpets sounding a soldier's knell; next the horse of the deceased, covered with mourning; and the procession was closed with several thousand men, with sea-green and black ribands, and a great number of women. The first open act of rebellion was at Banbury, in Oxfordshire. It was soon put down; but, at Salisbury, matters assumed a darker aspect. The insurgents mustered above a thousand strong, and attempted to form a junction with their associates in Warwick, Oxford, and Gloucestershire. The energies of Cromwell and Fairfax were now roused; by a rapid march they came unexpectedly upon the insurgents, who surrendered at discretion. The advantage thus gained was skilfully improved; the whole affair was buried in oblivion, and, by the union of firmness and leniency on the part of its leaders, the whole army was, in a short space, reduced to their duty. A more difficult and delicate task remained to achieve. The insurrection had been put down, but its manifest author was yet to be dealt with. After much hesitation, it was finally resolved to try Lilburne and his associates before the upper bench. Meanwhile parliament was assailed with petitions on behalf of the prisoners, and even the women of London besieged the doors of the house of commons from day to day, to urge that their favourite should be set at liberty. The government keenly felt its embarrassment, and ultimately resolved to abandon the prosecution. It provided, however, for future emergencies, by getting a bill passed, declaring what offences shall be adjudged to be treason. Soon after, Lilburne was dismissed on bail

The 'audacious and intrepid sower of sedition,' nothing daunted by the experience of the past, was scarcely clear of the Tower, before he re-commenced his attacks on the government by the publication of a political discourse, entitled, 'The Legal Fundamental Liberties of the People of England, revived, asserted, and vindicated.' In this piece he calls the commons "a company of bloody and inhuman butchers;" and, towards the close, he addresses the heads of the government in these terms: "Oh Cromwell, Fairfax, Ireton, Haselrig, I will answer you as Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, of old, answered your brother-tyrant, Nebuchadnezzar!" This invective was followed up by another, equally bitter, entitled, 'An Impeachment of High Treason against Cromwell and Ireton;' and, on the back of this, came a still more dangerous piece, entitled, 'The Outcry of the Apprentices.' In this last, Lilburne renewed his tampering with the soldiery. The government was now driven upon strong measures. A commission of oyer and terminer for the trial of such persons as were concerned in the publication of the 'Outcry' was issued, and, three days after, Lilburne was re-conducted to the Tower. He now, for the first time, seems to have become alarmed for himself, and made an offer to withdraw to America on payment of the arrears of compensation-money due to him. Of this offer no notice was taken, and his trial was allowed to proceed. It lasted two days, and terminated with a verdict of acquittal. His defence was bold and ingenious, but the conduct of the judges, in refusing to allow him counsel, and their unjust and overbearing manner towards him, seems to have disgusted the minds of the jury, and to have determined them to acquit the prisoner.

The arch-agitator remained quiet after this for the extraordinary period of two years. At the end of this period, he attacked Sir Arthur Haselrig in a virulent tract, for some proceedings of the committee of sequestration, of which Sir Arthur was chairman. Haselrig was a man highly respected and beloved by the leading republicans; and a committee being appointed to examine into Lilburne's charges, they pronounced them defamatory. The conclusion of the business was, that Lilburne was sentenced to pay a severe fine, and to be banished for life. This occurred in January, 1652.

The place of retreat which the exiled demagogue made choice of was Holland. Here he found himself surrounded by royalists,—the very men whom of all others he had most reason to dread. The fear of assassination was now perpetually haunting him, and at last he resolved to sacrifice character to personal safety, and flung himself fairly and at once into the hands of the royalists, by making a proposition to them to overturn the existing government of England, provided the requisite means were furnished him. These means were only £10,000; with this sum, he said, he could get a number of tracts printed at Amsterdam and dispersed over England, before the influence of which, Cromwell and his party would not be able to stand six months. His proposals were not accepted; and he next applied himself to obtain a repeal of the sentence of banishment by addressing a respectful and conciliatory letter to Cromwell. But his entire character and conduct had disgusted the man who had often before exhibited much generosity of temper towards him, and he treated the application with scornful silence. Disappointed in this, Lilburne resolved to brave all conse-

quences, and proceeded to London without permission. The next day he was apprehended and committed to Newgate. His trial came on at the Old Bailey on the 13th of July, 1653, and continued with various interruptions to the 20th of the following month. The jury again acquitted the prisoner, but he was remanded to prison on the charge of correspondence with the royalists, and was sent to Elizabeth castle in the isle of Jersey; here he behaved with great contumacy; but was finally liberated when far gone in consumption. His death took place immediately after in August 1657. Godwin has ably contrasted the characters of Lilburne and Cromwell in the following remarks: "Cromwell always acted like a politician; he had certain ends in view, and he modified his measures in the way that he conceived would be most conducive to those ends. At this time we have no reason to think that Cromwell had any sinister views. His object was the public welfare according to the ideas he entertained respecting it; and he steadily adopted such proceedings as he judged would best promote that object. Individuals were with him but implements in constructing the edifices of the public good: and in such a man the private passions of love and hatred could scarcely be said to bear sway; he chose those persons whom he conceived best adapted to the purposes he proposed; he treated them upon a principle correspondent with these views; he spared no man from ideas of personal respect; he made no man an enemy that he might gratify any feelings of resentment and indignation. Lilburne, with perhaps equal integrity,¹ was in many respects the reverse of this. He looked at principles and men as they were in themselves, rather than as links in the great chain of causes and consequences. He chose a cause, and he adhered to it, unterrified by menaces or suffering; though, as we shall see, when his exertions appeared to him entirely hopeless, he was not inflexibly bent against all compromise, but was willing by retreat to save the shattered wrecks of his own peace. In the same manner he chose an adversary, satisfying himself that the man against whom he drew out the powers of his hostility, was worthless, a traitor to the principles he had avowed to support and a foe to the public welfare; and resolving in that case never to quit the prosecution of his crimes, till they had received an ample retribution. Lilburne was therefore fiercer, and in that sense of a more unalterable temperament than Cromwell, who, while he never shrunk from any means the cause in which he was engaged rendered indispensable, was largely imbued with sentiments of clemency, forbearance and philanthropy. In the contrast here presented to us it is some disadvantage, that the adherent of what we may denominate the better principle, afterwards turned apostate, and was then urged by sinister views, if he were not now. But the historian treats of facts, not of fictions; and these two men, such as they were, stand together as striking examples of two opposing forms of public conduct."

¹ The historian is speaking of Lilburne before his flight to Holland.

Oliver Cromwell.

BORN A. D. 1599.—DIED A. D. 1658.

OLIVER CROMWELL, Protector of the Commonwealth of England from the year 1653 to his death in 1658, was unquestionably one of the most distinguished individuals whose names figure in the page of British history. His biography, both personal and public, is full of interest and instruction. It is, however, necessary to premise, that the true delineation of his character is no easy task, owing to the unmerited obloquy or the extravagant praise which have been alternately attached to his name by friends and foes. Some parts of his life are involved in much obscurity. Malicious attempts to degrade his character were deemed so meritorious, and found so acceptable in the age succeeding his own, that many falsehoods have become current, and many facts have been misrepresented. We shall attempt, as far as our means and limits will allow, to sift the true from the false, and shall set down nothing to his credit or disgrace that is of questionable authority.

He was born April 25, 1599, in the parish of St John, Huntingdon. His father, Robert Cromwell, was the second son of Sir John Cromwell of Hinchinbrook, in the county of Huntingdon; and his mother was Elizabeth, sister of Sir Thomas Stewart of Ely, both ancient and honourable families. At the time of Oliver's birth his father was engaged in the trade of a brewer in the town of Huntingdon.¹ Oliver was educated first in the grammar-school of his native town, and was then sent at the age of seventeen to Cambridge, where he entered as fellow-commoner in Sidney college. His youthful and boyish years have been scrutinized with an evil eye, and some charges of a morose, turbulent, and ill-starred disposition have been founded upon them; but we cannot find that there is any clear authority for indicting him upon any gross charge at that early period, at least not beyond the delinquencies of other robust and spirited young gentlemen. He was neither remarkably dull nor eminently clever,—neither essayed juvenile rebellions nor enacted in embryo the deposition of a tyrant, by leading his playmates to overturn the throne of their pedagogue,—but appears to have passed through the period of his education with average decorum and respectability. From all that has been alleged respecting his boyish days it appears that he was thoughtful and meditative above most of his companions, and that his natural courage prompted him to defend himself whenever he felt the hand of petty oppression. Probably his bodily strength was answerable to his courage, and made him thereby the terror of those who attempted to insult him, or play off the tyrant.

About one year after he took up his residence at college, his father died, and he is said to have been recalled to his mother's house. But there is no certain evidence of his having forsaken his studies at this time. It has been stated, without any adequate foundation, that he was sent by his mother to Lincoln's inn, and entered as a student of law, and that during his residence there he lived a most dissolute life.

¹ Memoirs of Cromwell, by Noble, and by O. Cromwell.

But this too is unsupported by evidence, and most probably is a mere tale invented by malignant enemies. If he ever fell into vicious habits in his youth, they were not of long continuance, for his marriage took place at the age of 21, and he was not deprived of his father's care and control till his 19th year. His wife was Elizabeth, daughter of Sir James Bouchier of Fitsted, Essex, descended from the earls of Essex of that name. He had not yet embraced the principles of the puritans, but continued a zealous episcopalian, and if he had been a licentious man, undoubtedly became reformed before he embraced puritanism, for his private life after marriage was one of exemplary virtue both as a husband and father. But we suspect the whole charge of having lived dissolutely in his youth was founded upon his use of that language of self-abasement, common to the puritans, in which he indulged when he embraced their principles, as may be seen in a letter he wrote to Mrs St John, preserved by Thurloe. All his biographers agree that from the period of his marriage he lived a very sober and harmless life. By the death of his uncle Sir Thomas Stewart, he came into the possession of an estate of £400 per annum, and in consequence took up his abode in the isle of Ely, between 1636 and 1638.

Cromwell first entered parliament in the year 1625, for the town of Huntingdon, and again in 1627, for the same place. His third election was for the borough of Cambridge, a fact which sufficiently speaks his respectability and influence at this period. This third election took place in 1640, but the parliament was of short duration. His popularity in his own district of the country seems in the first instance to have arisen from the spirited opposition he made to the drainage of the Lincolnshire fens. This has been set down to the score of his factious disposition, and has been construed into a want of public spirit. But it has been clearly proved that his opposition to the measure, attached not to the undertaking in the abstract, but to the *job* which its projectors intended to make of it.

In Charles's third parliament, which met in 1628, Cromwell took an active part in defence of the protestant cause, against Bishop Neile, and others, who seemed anxious to revive popery or at least to favour it. About this period the king seemed resolved on governing without a parliament, and the long intervals and frequent interruptions which now occurred, seem to have induced him, in company with Hampden and many others, to quit their native country for New England. This determination on the part of Cromwell, has been by most of the biographers attributed to the state of his private affairs, which they almost uniformly represent as ruined and desperate. But there does not appear any ground for such an insinuation. If there had been, the failure of his scheme, through the order of the king, would inevitably have brought it to light. Cromwell, with Hampden, continued in England—as we have stated at length in the introductory chapter to this part of our work—and without the slightest evidence of being crippled in his private fortune.

He was chosen for Cambridge in the parliament which first assembled in November 3d, 1640, known as the long parliament, and in which he became so distinguished a member. He is represented as a constant attendant in his place, and a frequent speaker in this parliament. Indeed, the affairs of the nation were now assuming a character which called forth into vigorous action all the heroic and manly spirits

of the age. He is stated to have been slovenly in his appearance, coarse and rude in his oratory, and withal fiery in his temper. Speaking of grievances in no way soft or courtly terms, but, we suppose, as became a Briton and a member of parliament, his oratory may not have been of the first order, neither could it have been very inferior or so rude as his enemies state, otherwise it never could have produced such effects as it manifestly did. His ability both for speech and action rose with the exigencies of the time. To deny to him great genius for the management of public affairs, and great powers of persuasion and command, would be to contradict the testimony of history. To admit that he rose to a station of proud pre-eminence in an age distinguished by every kind of human greatness, and yet to represent him as a man of inferior talents, were to court a paradox and affect an absurdity. Yet such have been the base and blind and false asseverations of the courtly advocates that wrote in the following age.

About the year 1641, affairs began to wear a more threatening aspect. It was evident that a collision must take place. The king was resolved against concession, and every act did but betray more fully to the nation the fatuity which attended all his counsels. In 1642, the parliament resolved upon raising forces. Then first Cromwell commenced his military career. He went immediately to Cambridge and raised a troop of horse of which he was appointed commander.² His services at Cambridge proved highly advantageous to the popular cause. But his first bold enterprize was made against Sir Thomas Coningsby, whom the king had recently appointed sheriff of Hertfordshire, commanding him to proclaim the earl of Essex and his army traitors. Coningsby had so done—but Cromwell came suddenly upon him at St Albans, and having made him prisoner, brought him to London.³ For this spirited action the parliament returned him their thanks, and soon after gave him a colonel's commission with the command of a regiment of cavalry. From this period, his military career became conspicuous, and even splendid. In six associated counties, Essex, Hertfordshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire, he established the power of the parliament, and then advanced against the royal garrison of Newark. After this he checked the king's troops under the earl of Newcastle, and performed many other important and distinguished services. Soon after this period the house of parliament passed the self-denying ordinance, which was directed to the exclusion of all members of parliament from military command, with the exception of Cromwell. In consequence of this step, the earl of Manchester retired from the head of the army, and Sir Thomas Fairfax was appointed in his place. Cromwell was made lieutenant-general of cavalry, and speedily distinguished himself by the most brilliant actions. At the battle of Marston-moor, which took place July 3d, 1644, Cromwell's management of the cavalry is said to have turned the fortunes of the day in favour of the parliamentary army. In the autumn of the same year, at the second battle of Newbury, he charged the king's guards with such skill and courage that he had nearly taken him prisoner. From the command of the cavalry he now rose to be lieutenant-general of the army, and in almost every movement displayed consummate skill and courage. It may

² List of Essex's army.

³ May.

readily be supposed that his extensive popularity and unrivalled military successes contributed to turn the eyes of the nation upon him as the great bulwark of its interests; and it is not improbable that ambitious thoughts were the offspring of those great military achievements which had thus made him the actual protector of the national rights and liberties. Many who affect unusual insight into human nature, profess to see at this early period the lurking design of seizing the crown for himself and his family. But we are disposed to think that this project had not yet sullied his patriotism, and that when it did, it arose less from the natural bias of his mind, always generous and liberal, than from the critical circumstances in which he found both himself and the nation placed. Patriotism first forced him into power, and then he was both impelled to keep what he had gained, to prevent the undoing of all the noble struggles of a great people to obtain liberty, and to grasp at more, in order to use what he already possessed with any efficiency for the permanent establishment of national freedom.

Under Fairfax and Cromwell, the army was new-modelled and a new system of warfare adopted. From this period success attended all their movements; and finally the royal cause was entirely ruined in the decisive battle of Naseby, fought June 14th, 1645, in which Cromwell commanded with his usual intrepidity and skill. This battle closed the military career of King Charles, and gave an undisputed triumph in all quarters to the popular cause. After some feeble attempts on the part of the king to rally his friends, he formed the design of throwing himself into the hands of the Scottish army, which had advanced as far as Newark. But by them he was soon after delivered up to the parliament and conveyed to Holmby house. It has been usual to attribute to Cromwell the project of removing the king from this place to the head-quarters of the army without the permission of either the general-in-chief or the parliamentary leaders—then of inducing the king to escape to the isle of Wight, through pretended plots against his life, and so of inducing him to leave the kingdom. But the whole is, we believe, without any satisfactory foundation in fact, and had its origin in the malicious conjectures and imaginings of his enemies. Historians, one after another, have repeated what the first chose to assert—but none would trouble themselves to examine. But it has been recently shown that the removal of the king from the custody of the parliamentary commissioners, was wholly a plot of the republican agitators in the army, who had grown jealous of the intentions of Cromwell and of the parliament to restore the king.⁴

The king having been induced to take the rash step of escaping from Hampton court to the isle of Wight, fell into the custody of Hammond, governor of the island. At this juncture a new attempt in favour of the royal cause arose with the Welch, which Cromwell speedily quelled. After this a formidable party appeared in the north, and they were joined by many who had formerly espoused the cause of the parliament. Against them also Cromwell took the field, and with astonishing skill and energy, annihilated, in a single battle, all the hopes of this new party. Having placed the government of Scotland in the hands of

⁴ Any one who wishes to see this whole question calmly and fully examined may consult with satisfaction Mr Cromwell's *Memoirs of the Protector*, p. 319.

trusty friends to the popular cause, he returned to London. Here he found every thing falling into confusion, and faction contending with faction. Every attempt at a reconciliation with the king had failed, either through the obstinacy, which refused all concession, or the extravagance which demanded too much. It is next to impossible to unravel the tangle of contradictory statements which are given of affairs and parties at this juncture. Cromwell himself hardly escaped an impeachment by one party,⁵ while another seized the person of the king, and lodged him by force in Hurst castle.

After this a violent party in the parliament began to cry out against delinquents, and to demand that they should be brought to trial, and that the greatest of them ought not to escape. It is manifest, from Whitelock and others, that Cromwell, at this most alarming period, did all in his power to prevent the violent republicans from bringing the king to trial. On the other hand, Cromwell found the presbyterians uniformly zealous for the restoration of the monarchy; and these having a large majority in the house of commons, had conducted, and nearly concluded, a treaty with the king, which would have placed the more liberal parties, both in politics and religion, in a situation quite as insupportable as that in which they had first fled to arms. It is probable, therefore, that at this conjuncture Cromwell, with the other officers, first determined to unite with the stern republicans in resisting the united efforts of the presbyterians and royalists, to restore the monarchy, and with it all the former intolerance of the church. The army was brought into London, and General Fairfax, with the other military men, set themselves in an attitude to overawe the parliament. Proceeding with their plan, they purged the parliament by seizing and dismissing the presbyterian members. The council of officers was now the supreme power in the state; and it is probable that Cromwell soon found himself the most influential member of that body. The design of bringing the king to trial does not appear to have originated with the officers, but with the republicans in parliament. They accordingly proceeded to declare it to be treason, by the fundamental laws of the kingdom, in the king, for the time being, to levy war against the parliament and kingdom of England;—the people, under God, to be the original of all just power;—that the commons of England in parliament being chosen by, and representing the people, had the supreme power of the nation;—and that all things declared by them to be law, had the force of law, and all the people of the nation concluded thereby, without the consent of the king and house of peers. They then passed the ordinance for the trial of the king. It appears from all the accounts which have been preserved of those ‘tumultuating times,’ that Cromwell was far from being the designer and mover of this questionable transaction. When it was broached in parliament, it is well known that he stood up and declared, “that if any man moved this upon design, he should think him the greatest traitor in the world; but since Providence and necessity had cast them upon it, he should pray God to bless their counsels, though he were not prepared on the sudden to give them counsel.” It appears, however, that afterwards he gave it his sanction, and was persuaded to believe that such a measure could

⁵ Journals.

alone rescue the nation from the contentions and factions with which it had long been torn.

After the trial and execution of the king, a council of state was formed, of which Cromwell became the chief member. At this period it was doubtless the intention of those who had taken the most active part in the popular cause, to establish a republic. But the leading parties in the army and in the nation were by no means agreed. Mutinies among the troops were of frequent occurrence, and no man but Cromwell could quell them. His promptitude, courage, and decision, soon brought the army completely under his control. But this very circumstance tended to his aggrandisement. Opposition seemed to expire before his presence, or only to contribute to his elevation. During these proceedings in England, the most alarming and formidable contentions arose in Ireland. Cromwell immediately accepted the office of lord-lieutenant, and, in the course of a single spring campaign, struck such terror into the rebellious of all classes that he was enabled before midsummer to re-establish order and return to England. Fresh troubles now arose from the presbyterians, who, both in England and Scotland, entered into a formidable conspiracy to restore the royal power. Charles Stuart had been secretly invited into Scotland, where he had assurance of efficient support. An army was prepared, and all things ready for the invasion of England. In this critical conjuncture, Fairfax, who had retained, up to this period, the supreme command of the army under the parliament, professed scruples of conscience, as a presbyterian, in acting against his brethren, and in consequence, the army fell into the hands of Cromwell. He speedily appeared at the head of 22,000 well-disciplined troops, whom he led against the Scots, headed by their nobility and clergy, and at the battle of Dunbar completely routed them. In consequence of this splendid victory, Edinburgh and all other important places were soon reduced under his power, and put in a state of complete subjection to the parliament of England. Scarcely had he settled these affairs, when he heard that the young prince, who had been so signally defeated, had set up his standard in England, and that a considerable body of Scots and English had already flocked to it. With the utmost expedition he moved his army into England, and after watching the movements of the royal army for a short time, came up with them at length at Worcester, a place which they had themselves chosen as the scene of their conflict with the parliamentary forces. On the 3d of September, the great battle was fought, which, in every part of it, displayed the superior military genius of Cromwell, and contributed to elevate him to that high post which he afterwards filled. This victory completely extinguished all the hopes of Charles and his friends, of regaining power by meeting their enemies in the open field. It was called by Cromwell his 'crowning victory.' Both this and the battle of Dunbar, in which the royalists were said to be double the numbers of the commonwealth-men, may be appealed to in proof of the eminent talents and personal courage of this extraordinary man. The republican cause, in his hand, had triumphed over all opposition in Ireland, Scotland, and England, and left him now little else to accomplish but to mould or coerce the turbulent spirits that had surrounded him, into an agreement upon the form of government to be finally established. He returned to London after the battle of Worcester, and

was received by the council, the parliament, and the people, with enthusiastic demonstrations of joy and admiration. The parliament voted him £4,000 per annum, as the reward of his services. But from this period his ambition began to appear. There was no one to divide with him the popular favour and attention. The parliament had become odious, and would not accede to his views of a settlement. On April 20th, 1653, he entered the house with some soldiers, displaced the speaker, ordered the mace to be removed, turned out all the members, and having locked the door, put the keys in his pocket, and retired.⁶

His next step was to summon a new parliament, called Barebones; but this was soon after dismissed, and the council of officers again assumed the supreme authority. They drew up an instrument of government, which was assented to by the commissioners of the great seal, the mayor and aldermen of London, divers of the judges of the land, the officers of the state and army, and many other persons of quality. This was publicly recognised on the 16th of December, 1653, and by it Cromwell was constituted protector of the commonwealth. An oath was administered to him, by which he swore to observe the provisions of the instrument.⁷

Being thus formally invested in Westminster-hall with the full power of administration, he applied himself to the discharge of its duties with unrivalled wisdom and energy. Considering the divided and exhausted state of the kingdom, it is truly surprising that, in so short a period, he should have been able to quell all factions, restore order, promote all the national interests, and raise the reputation and influence of his country abroad to a pitch unattained by any monarch before or since. He now proved himself as great in the cabinet as before he had been in the field. His powers of persuasion and command became alike the admiration of foreigners and of his own countrymen. He speedily made an honourable peace with Holland, and thereby put an end to a sanguinary naval war which had been long raging. He entered into advantageous treaties with Denmark and Portugal, and cultivated successfully the friendship of Sweden, France, and Spain. The two formidable rivals of Southern Europe both courted his favour, and never was a choice of friendship between two competing powers better decided than when he gave the preference to France. In fact, the whole of his foreign policy was conducted upon the soundest principles, and with a foresight which was amply justified and accredited by the rising glory and prosperity of Great Britain. His army and navy were regulated with an exclusive regard to their efficiency, and the success which every where attended their operations demonstrated the wisdom and patriotism which regulated all his appointments. At home, his conduct of the government delighted his friends and disarmed his enemies. The law was every where administered with impartiality and ability—toleration was granted to all who did not interfere with the civil authority. He allowed no sect to domineer, and repressed persecution wherever it appeared. The rights of every man's conscience he held sacred, and the civil liberties of all the subjects of the commonwealth were alike the objects of his protection.

⁶ Whitelock, 554.—Ludlow, ii. 19.—Burton's Diary.

⁷ Exact Relation, 26.—Thurloe.—Clarendon.

Exposed as he was to the hatred of two large and powerful parties, the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians, whose determination was to have a king and an exclusive church-establishment, it may be supposed that his high station was attended with no little personal danger. The plots formed against his life were numerous. These, however, he always contrived to elude or suppress, and, what is unusual in men in like situations, he manifested no personal resentment, and exercised no wanton cruelty against the agents of these plots. Indeed, his treatment of those who were known to be guilty of rebellion against the government, and of designs to remove the protector, was characterized by moderation and magnanimity. Finding that his government could not be upheld without legal taxation, and being unwilling to levy supplies without the consent of parliament, he ventured, in 1654, to summon a new parliament. The elections were allowed to be conducted with the greatest freedom and impartiality. The day fixed for its assembling was the 3d of September—the anniversary of his two great victories at Dunbar and Worcester. But when this parliament assembled, it seemed to threaten the deposition of the protector, and the entire overthrow of the constitution which had been agreed to. Within five months therefrom, it was dissolved, without affording those supplies which were requisite for maintaining the present order of things.

In 1655, the royalists, in concert with the exiled prince, had taken the fatal resolution of a general rising throughout England. But Cromwell was thoroughly informed of all their plans, and allowed them to ripen into insurrection before he used any means against them. About two hundred of the cavaliers suddenly appeared at Salisbury, seized the judges and sheriff, who were holding the assizes, and proclaimed King Charles II. This bold enterprise was, however, not favoured by the people. The protector suppressed them by a single troop of horse. The failure of the insurrection served merely to establish his power, to expose all royalists to his revenge, and to tempt him on to a bolder exercise of his power. He proceeded to punish the adherents of the exiled royal family by levying upon them a tax, through the medium of ten or twelve major-generals, who took each a district of the kingdom. This measure has been malignantly distorted for party-purposes. It has been stated by Hume, and such like writers, that it consisted in a decimation of royalist property, and he represents them as reduced by it to the extreme of poverty and want. But after all, it was merely a tax of ten per cent. upon their incomes, with a restriction confining its operation to persons who possessed estates of above £100 per annum, in land, or personal property to the value of £1,500. This measure was accompanied with various other regulations for the suppression of tumults and treasons, and for the maintenance of a vigilant police. The whole of these measures, committed as they were to the administration of military officers and commissioners, cannot be represented as otherwise than highly arbitrary and tyrannical. Their execution was attended with much tumult and confusion.

In the midst of these domestic difficulties, the protector declared war against Spain. This has been represented as both impolitic and unjust. But when it is considered that Spain had entered into a secret compact to restore the exiled prince, and had its emissaries in England with a view to the accomplishment of that purpose, it can hardly be said that

Cromwell was bound to keep any terms with a state of whose perfidy towards his government there were ample proofs. In this war, though his arms suffered some disasters, yet his successes amply compensated them. In one engagement Blake took specie alone to the value of above a million sterling. An expedition, under two other admirals, put the protector in possession of the island of Jamaica; and finally, by the combined forces of England and France, Dunkirk was surrendered and taken possession of by the protector's troops. These successes made his name every where famous, and filled every foreign prince with such a fear of incurring his displeasure, that his demands and remonstrances were in almost all cases complied with. "To reduce three nations that perfectly hated him, to entire obedience to all his dictates; to awe and govern those nations by an army undevoted to him, and wished his ruin, was an instance of very prodigious address. But his greatness at home was but a shadow of the glory he had abroad. It was hard to discover which feared him most, France, Spain, or the Low Countries, where his friendship was current at the value he put upon it; that as they did all sacrifice their honour and their interest to his pleasure, so there was nothing he could have demanded that either of them would have denied him."

But, notwithstanding this extension of his glory, and establishment of his power, it is evident that he would have preferred a legal and constitutional government. His natural bias lay unquestionably in favour of liberty. He made several advances towards it, and if his proceedings were tyrannical, they were so rather from the emergency of his affairs and the failure of more moderate and legal methods of upholding the state. In the year 1656, he resolved upon remodelling the whole government. A parliament was summoned, from which one hundred members were excluded by the oaths he imposed, and many of the remainder soon evinced the most determined hostility. A bold project was however now attempted by his friends, under the title of 'the humble petition and advice.' Its object was professedly to induce him to take upon himself the title of *king*. It was also attempted to revive the institution of the two houses of parliament, and to secure the integrity of the representative system. The title of king was however declined, but a new inauguration of the protector was decreed by this parliament with much of the splendour of a coronation. This took place June 26th, 1656. During this year he fell into much fear for his personal safety, owing to the frequent plots formed for his assassination, which, however, generally came to his knowledge. One Sexby openly published a pamphlet, entitled, "Killing no murder," the object of which was to prompt tyrannicide. After these alarms, the protector usually carried loaded pistols when he went abroad. Several of the cavaliers were tried and executed upon charges of high treason against Cromwell, and among them a clergyman of the name of Hewett. His life was earnestly implored by Mrs Claypole, the protector's favourite daughter, but in vain. Her reproaches on her death-bed, soon after, are said deeply to have affected him and disturbed his peace of mind.⁸

Various troubles now impeded his movements, arising principally from the parliament, but under them all he displayed great elasticity

⁸ Clarendon.—Bulstrode.

and vigour of mind. Beset by men of all parties, each pursuing the overthrow of the existing government, scared by incessant plots of assassination, and threatened by invasion on behalf of the exiled Charles, he yet continued to keep all these evils at bay, and to thwart every combination, whether of royalists or republicans. But his perplexities in public affairs were attended with several severe family afflictions, which preyed upon his spirits. These were accompanied with an attack of gout, the bad treatment of which by his physicians appears to have been attended with much injury to his general health. About the end of July, his robust constitution appeared to be giving way, and in the course of the following month he became incapacitated for public business. His strong affection for his family appears to have been the chief cause of his last illness. Nothing can be more touching, and nothing more amiable than his affection, both as a son and as a father. Amidst the cares and anxieties of his public station he displayed the deepest interest in the welfare and comfort of all his relatives, and watched over their sorrows and sufferings with exemplary solicitude and tenderness—thus affording a most pleasing relief to the stern and resolute temper which marked all his political movements. Shortly after the death of his daughter Claypole, he was attacked by a tertian ague, which at first wore no alarming symptoms. He is represented as indulging confident expectations of recovery, and as telling his wife, “I shall not die this bout, I am sure of it.” His physicians, however, were of a different opinion, and on the 30th of August, urged him, agreeable to the petition and advice, to name a successor. Some doubts exist whether he ever did so; but Thurloe expressly says it took place on the 30th of August, and was again repeated on the 2d of September.

On his death-bed he was attended by Dr Goodwin and others. Several stories are told of his questions to these divines, but they are handed down by enemies, and cannot be relied on. There is, however, no reason to doubt the sincerity of his faith in his last moments. No stain of religious hypocrisy can be fixed upon his character.⁹ Few of royal race ever displayed more of the Christian virtues, and none surpassed him in all that was becoming and amiable in private life. The night before he died he was heard to utter the following prayer:—“Lord, I am a poor foolish creature; this people would fain have me live; they think it will be best for them, and that it will redound much to thy glory: all the stir is about this: others would fain have me die. Lord, pardon them, and pardon thy foolish people; forgive their sins, and do not forsake them; but love, and bless them, and give them rest; and bring them to consistency, and give me rest, for Jesus Christ’s sake, to whom, with thyself and the Holy Spirit, be all honour and glory.” He expired on the 3d September, 1658, in the 60th year of his age.

There can be no doubt that though Cromwell’s death gave unbounded joy to a large majority of the nation, because nearly all viewed his usurpation with jealousy, yet his character commanded respect, and multitudes who hated his assumption of royal power yet remembered him as the deliverer of the nation from hateful tyranny and cruel persecution. Nothing could be a more striking proof of the respect which

⁹ Lingard vii. 279.

had once been felt for him, while his patriotism was pure and unsullied by ambition, than the unrivalled pomp of his funeral. His obliquities seemed to be all forgotten, and the glory of his name alone—a glory in which the nation had the largest share—seemed to move all men to do him honour. This was the spontaneous and honest tribute paid to his high talents and eminent services before the influence of party-feeling had poisoned the public mind, or spread abroad its insinuations against his sincerity and piety.

Almost the only fault which the protector displayed, at least the only one of glaring criminality, and with which his country had to do, was ambition. Hence his government became in the end one of expedients and not of principles. There can be no doubt that the object uppermost in his heart from first to last, was the happiness and virtue of the people, over whom he had almost insensibly gained the rule. He assuredly believed that he had been placed by Providence in circumstances that compelled him to assume that rule, and he never seems to have been unconscious that he had accepted that rule exclusively for the purpose of promoting the welfare of the nation. The moral and religious improvement of his subjects was the object of his anxious solicitude. His character has been little understood, because it fell to his enemies to misrepresent it, as the means of purchasing favour to themselves. It is however daily emerging more and more illustrious from the falsifying and calumniating pens of such writers as Clarendon, Keath, and Hume.

Milton speaks of him with enthusiastic admiration. "He was a soldier thoroughly accomplished in the art of self-knowledge, and his first successes were against the internal enemies of human virtue, vain hopes, fears, aspirings, and ambition. His first triumphs were over himself; and he was thus enabled, from the day that he beheld an enemy in the field, to exhibit the endowments of a veteran. Such was the temper and discipline of his mind, that all the good and the valiant were irresistibly drawn to his camp, not merely as the best school of martial science, but also of piety and religion; and those who joined it were necessarily rendered such by his example. In his empire over the minds of his followers, he was surpassed neither by Epaminondas, nor Cyrus, nor any of the most vaunted generals of antiquity. Thus he formed to himself an army of men, who were no sooner under his command than they became the patterns of order, obedient to his slightest suggestions, popular, and beloved by their fellow-citizens, and to the enemy not more terrible in the field than welcome in their quarters. In the towns and villages where they sojourned, no way offensive or rapacious, abstaining from violence, wine, intemperance, and impiety, so that suddenly the inhabitants, rejoicing in their disappointment, regarded them not as enemies, but as guests and protectors, a terror to the disorderly, a safe-guard to the good, and by precept and example, the teachers of all piety and virtue." George Fox, the founder of the quakers, gives a coincident testimony to that of Milton; and William Penn winds up his account by saying,—“Many sons have done virtuously; but thou excellest them all.” The public measures of Cromwell respecting the promotion of protestantism and the liberties of protestants in foreign countries, are worthy of perpetual memorial. His declaration respecting the protestants of Pied-

mont became a Christian of enlarged mind; "that the calamities of these poor people lay as near, or rather nearer to his heart, than if it had concerned the dearest relations he had in the world."

His measure for removing immoral clergymen out of the church, above most of his acts, has been misrepresented and condemned; but let the judgment of Baxter upon that subject—himself no admirer of Cromwell—determine its wisdom and utility:—"The commissioners under this act saved many a congregation from ignorant, ungodly, drunken teachers,—that sort of men who intend no more in the ministry than to say a sermon, as readers say their common prayers, and so patch a few good words together to talk the people asleep on Sunday, and all the rest of the week go with them to the ale-house, and harden them in sin; and that sort of ministers who either preach against a holy life, or preach as men that were never acquainted with it: these they usually rejected, and in their stead admitted any that were able, serious preachers, and lived a godly life, of what tolerable opinion soever they were. So that though many of them were partial to the independents, separatists, fifth monarchy men, and anabaptists, and against the prelatists and Arminians, yet so great was the benefit above the hurt that they brought to the church, that many thousands of souls blessed God for the faithful ministers whom they let in, and grieved when the prelatists afterwards, (in August 1662,) cast them out again."

It is observed by Mr Godwin in his history of the commonwealth, that "Cromwell's character perpetually rose in the estimation of his subjects. He appeared to them every day more like a king, and less like the plain and unambitious descendant of the Cromwells of Hinchinbrook and Ramsey. His abilities were every hour more and more evident and confessed. His capacity for government became daily more unquestionable. He looked into every thing; he provided for every thing; he stood himself unmoved, yet causing every threatening and tempestuous phenomenon by which he was assailed to fly before him." He had six children, four daughters and two sons. Richard succeeded him for a short period in the protectorate. He died in 1712. Henry was made lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and deceased in 1674. Bridget, married first to Ireton and afterwards to Fleetwood. Elizabeth, married to John Claypole, Esq. of Northamptonshire. Mary, married to Lord Fauconberg; and Frances, married to the earl of Warwick, and subsequently to John Russel, Esq. of Cambridgeshire.

John Bradshaw.

DIED A. D. 1659.

JOHN BRADSHAW, who presided during the ever-memorable trial of Charles I., was descended from an ancient family of Lancashire. We have no memorials of his early years. He first appears in history as a favourite and well-employed chamber-counsel of the parliament party, to whose interests he was zealously devoted. He did not however confine himself to chamber-practice, but on several public occasions distinguished himself by great powers of eloquence, and the most daunt-

less intrepidity in avowing and defending these sentiments to which he adhered throughout the whole of his political and judicial career, which terminated only with his life. Milton, whose kinsman he was,¹ and who seems to have known him thoroughly, speaks of him in highly eulogistic terms: "Being of a distinguished family, he devoted the early part of his life to the study of the laws of his country. Hence he became an able and an eloquent pleader, and subsequently discharged all the duties of an uncorrupt judge. In temper neither gloomy nor severe, but gentle and placid, he exercised in his own house the rites of hospitality in an exemplary manner, and proved himself on occasions a faithful and unfailing friend. Ever eager to acknowledge merit, he assisted the deserving to the utmost of his power. Forward at all times to publish the talents and worth of others, he was always silent respecting his own. No one more ready to forgive, he was yet impressive and terrible, when it fell to his lot to pour shame on the enemies of his country. If the cause of the oppressed was to be defended, if the favour or the violence of the great was to be withstood, it was impossible in that case to find an advocate more intrepid or more eloquent, whom no threats, no terrors, and no rewards could seduce from the plain path of rectitude."²

In December, 1644, he was appointed high sheriff of Lancashire. In October 1646, when the great seal was placed in commission, he was appointed one of the commissioners. In October, 1648, he was called to the rank of serjeant as a preliminary step to the intended filling of the seats of the judges; and in the following February both houses voted him chief-justice of Chester.

When the commissioners for the trial of the king met to nominate counsel and the officers of court, their choice of president fell upon Bradshaw, who at first seemed much surprised, and endeavoured to excuse himself from compliance with the nomination. Clarendon of course represents Bradshaw's apparent unwillingness to accept of so high and so responsible an office as sheer hypocrisy. But this is a calumnious and totally unsupported assertion. The situation was one from which any but men of the very firmest nerves must have shrunk; it was also a highly invidious and a dangerous one. There was therefore much room for hesitating even before a man so resolute as Bradshaw could undertake to preside at the king's trial. And besides all this, that the nomination was unexpected by him is more than probable from the circumstance that in the first list of commissioners for the trial his name did not appear. It was only after the rejection of the ordinance by the upper house, and the subsequent erasure of the names of six lords, that his name with those of five others was substituted. A man thus introduced at the eleventh hour, as it were, into a body constituted for such a purpose as were the commissioners, could certainly not anticipate that the general vote would fall upon him. His conduct towards the king during the trial has also been pronounced harsh and unfeeling. It should be recollected, however, that no ordinary criminal stood before him, and moreover, that the temper and spirit of the court over which he presided was not likely to brook much ceremony and mildness on his part. Its members felt that they were met for the discharge of a

¹ Lives of E. and J. Philips, p. 336.

² Defensio secunda.

high and solemn duty; they saw and felt the responsibility of their situation, and they were quite competent to calculate the risk to which they were exposing themselves in sitting as judges upon him who had so recently been their monarch. It was no season then for any unnecessary formalities or courtesies on the part of any one, and least of all from him who was to head their deliberations and speak their sentiments and determination to the prisoner. Something also should be allowed for natural constitution, in estimating the comparative coldness or harshness of his bearing. Bradshaw was a man who would not have shrunk from doing justice on his own son. The stern and rigid administration of the law was, according to his estimate of things, the first and highest duty of a man occupying the situation which he filled. And this feeling was not likely to be greatly softened, but otherwise, by the consideration that the man upon whom he sat in judgment had been a king—his own lawful sovereign. Such was the stern and unbending firmness of the man, and so firm his conviction that in acting the part he did, he was discharging his duty to God and to his country, that on death-bed he declared that were Charles again before him, on the same charges which had been preferred against him in the high court of justice, he would be the first man to give his voice for condemnation.

On the death of Cromwell, and the restoration of the long parliament, Bradshaw obtained a seat in the council, and was elected president. He would also have been appointed commissioner of the great seal, but his infirm state of health obliged him to decline the latter office. He died on the 22d of November, 1659, and was pompously interred in Westminster abbey. At the restoration, his ashes were dug up and treated with the same wretched indignity which was offered to the remains of his brother-patriots, Cromwell and Ireton.

Sir Henry Vane.

BORN A. D. 1612.—DIED A. D. 1661.

THE family of Vane was originally settled in the county-palatine of Durham, but afterwards removed to Kent. Sir Henry Vane, born in 1589, was knighted by James I. in 1611, and was distinguished for his attachment to the royal family; although he promoted the impeachment of Strafford, and was dismissed from his office of secretary of state for the part he took in bringing that notorious political profligate to justice. He died in 1654, at his seat of Raby castle, to which he had retired some years before the death of Charles I.

His eldest son, the subject of the present sketch, was one of the leading spirits during the troublous but heroic period of the English commonwealth. He was born in 1612, and educated at Westminster school, whence he went to Magdalene hall, Oxford. It was during his residence at college that he first imbibed those political principles and feelings which subsequently rendered him one of the sternest and most uncompromising republicans of the age. His subsequent residence at Geneva,—“from which place, as from its seminary, the spirit of popular liberty has so often gone forth to other nations,”—expanded and confirmed those views of civil and ecclesiastical government which he

had begun to entertain before quitting home. On his return to England, finding how obnoxious his sentiments were to the party at least to which his father was attached, he instantly resolved to abandon his country rather than sacrifice any of those great principles which had become identified in his mind with truth and justice. Accordingly, with the consent of his father, who saw no hopes of obtaining political preferment for such a son at home, he retired to New England, and was almost immediately upon landing raised to the government of Massachusetts. Neal says he was "no sooner advanced to the government than he appeared to be a person of no conduct, and no ways equal to the part he was preferred to. Being a strong enthusiast, he openly espoused the Antinomian doctrines, and gave such encouragement to the preachers and speakers of them as raised their vanity, and gave them such an interest among the people, as the very next year had like to have proved fatal both to the church and commonwealth." Mather and Baxter write to the same effect. But when we consider the enthusiastic complexion of Vane's character, and that he was at this time a youth of only twenty-three years of age, we cannot but regard the strictures which those writers have passed upon his brief transactions in America as too severe and uncharitable. If Vane encouraged the Antinomians of New England, it cannot be said of him that he discouraged any other religious party or creed, for none was ever more tolerant in religious matters.

He seems to have returned to England in 1636, and soon after married Frances, daughter of Sir Christopher Wray of Ashby, in Lincolnshire. At his father's instance, he was now appointed, with Sir William Russell, to the treasurership of the navy. He, nevertheless, took deep disgust at the measures of the court, and throwing up his office, attached himself to the cause and fortunes of the country-party,—“a course,” says Lord Nugent, “sufficiently explained by the earliest and uniform disposition of his mind, but which has been lightly and ungenerously impugned by some who have imputed it, without any probability of truth, to resentment, on account of the mortified ambition and disappointed intrigues of his father,” Clarendon insinuates that the whole conduct of both the elder and younger Vane, in the matter of Strafford's impeachment, was dictated by offended pride. The minion had been created, or rather created himself Baron Raby, in 1639, in sheer contempt of the pretensions which the elder Vane had advanced to that title. This was probably the secret origin of the elder Vane's antipathy to his unfortunate colleague, but the son was too high-minded to be influenced by any such paltry and personal motives in any part of his political career.

In 1643, Vane was sent as one of the parliamentary commissioners to Scotland. He executed the delicate and important mission then entrusted to him with great skill and success. The Scots at first stood out for their own peculiar form of church polity and government being adopted in England, but Vane, with much persuasion, prevailed upon them to agree to the solemn league and covenant, by which instrument it was stipulated that “the protestant religion should be sustained in Scotland, according to the forms already established,” while the “reformation in England should be effected agreeably to the word of God, and the example of the best reformed churches.” Here was no com-

promise of principle on either side. Vane was an independent, but the agreement, it is evident, neither bound him nor the Scottish negotiators to any thing that was not in harmony with the dictates of their own consciences. Both parties trusted to the course of events bringing about that settled order both in church and state which they most desired.

In the debate on the famous self-denying ordinance, Vane took a distinguished part. Hume has followed Clarendon in his miserably garbled and distorted account of the proceeding, and represents Vane as maintaining that the whole measure was dictated by the immediate inspiration of the Spirit of God. This is false. Vane often spoke enthusiastically; but his speech on this occasion was as cool and clear-headed as could be desired in a deliberative assembly.

In 1646, Sir Henry issued a tract entitled, 'A Healing Question propounded and resolved, in reference to the invitation to a General Fast,' of which Godwin has given the following account:—"In this piece he maintains the natural right of the friends of liberty in England, confirmed as it was by their memorable victory over the enemies of that right, to be governed by national councils and successive representatives of their own election. The author declares this right to be in the friends of liberty exclusively, that is, in those who were known, and had distinguished themselves, by a forwardness to assist the public good and freedom of the nation. To express their faithfulness to this cause, they had largely contributed in one kind or another, what was proper for each in his place to do, and by so doing had acquired for themselves a claim of incorporation and society, to consult for their common good. To render this doctrine palatable and practicable in the present situation of affairs, the author praises the army; at the same time that he says, that not only the army as at present constituted, but the total of the well-meaning party, embodied in their military capacity, forms the proper, irresistible, and absolute strength of the nation. He expresses himself satisfied with the army, as now it is, under the command of an honest and wise general, and sober and faithful officers, and calls upon those in power to prepare all things requisite for the exercise of the general right, as, like faithful guardians to the commonwealth at present in its nonage, they are bound to do. This once put in a way, he proceeds, and declared for by the general and army, as that which they are clearly convinced in the sight of God, it is their duty to bring about, how firmly and freely would this bind the hearts and persons, the counsels and purses, the affections and prayers, of the whole party, to assist and strengthen the hands of those now in power, whatever straits and difficulties they might meet with in the maintenance of the public safety and peace! And, if this, which is so essential to the well being and right constitution of government, were once obtained, the disputes about the form would not prove so difficult, nor find such opposition, as to keep open a door of contention. Would a standing council of state, settled for life, in reference to the safety of the commonwealth, and for maintaining intercourse and correspondence with foreign states, under the inspection and oversight of the supreme judicature, be likely to meet with disapprobation? Might not the orders of this council, in the intervals of the supreme national assemblies, be made binding, so far as they were consonant to the settled laws of the commonwealth? Nay, would there be any just exception to be

taken, if it should be agreed, as another part of the fundamental constitution, to place that branch of sovereignty which chiefly respects the execution of the laws, in a distinct office, capable to be intrusted in the hands of one single person, if need should require, or in a greater number, and, for the greater strength and honour to this office, that the execution of all laws and orders that are binding, should go forth in his or their name, and all disobedience to, or contempt of them, be taken as done to the people's sovereignty, of which he or they bear the image, subordinate to the legislative power, and at their will to be continued in the same hands or otherwise, as the experience of its advantage or disadvantage might decide? This tract, however, though thus mild and temperate in its structure, was not entirely without passages that might give offence to the present government. It spoke of 'a great interruption that had lately taken place in regard to the expectations of the friends of liberty, and that, instead of setting up a national representative, something had arisen, that seemed rather accommodated to the private and selfish interest of a particular part, than truly adequate to the demands of the common interest and cause;' and further on, of 'what had been doing for the three years last past, as if God were pleased to stand still, and be as a looker-on, to see what his people would be in their latter end, and what work they would make of it, if left to their own wisdom and politic contrivances.'"

This pamphlet created no small uneasiness to Cromwell, who soon after caused Bradshaw, Vane, Rich, and Ludlow, to be summoned before the council to answer to certain charges of disaffection towards the existing government. Vane was at this time residing in comparative privacy at Belleau, in the county of Lincoln. He obeyed the mandate, but declined to comply with the order which the council issued, that he should give security in bond to the extent of £5,000, "to do nothing to the prejudice of the present government and the peace of the commonwealth," justly remarking, that by so doing he would, by his own act, bring his public character, and the goodness of the cause for which he suffered, under suspicion. Fourteen days were suffered to elapse, at the end of which period he was committed to Carisbrook castle, where he suffered imprisonment for the space of four months.

On the abdication of Richard Cromwell, Sir Henry was made one of the committee of safety, and president of the council, in which office he brought forward a new model for a republican government. But the council was not prepared to go the length which their president advised and urged, and at last dismissed him, as a man of wild and impracticable views, from all share in the government of the nation.

Upon the restoration, Vane, by an act of shameful perfidy, was brought to trial, on the 4th of June, 1662. He had been included in the indemnity stipulated for by the first convention; yet, in violation of that agreement, he was no sooner in the hands of the royalists than he was charged with compassing the death of Charles I., and proceeded against as a regicide. He defended himself nobly, but was found guilty, and executed on Tower-hill, on the 14th of June. He died with a composure and dignity worthy of the sentiments which had actuated him throughout his unblemished career, and of the high and immortal hopes by which his spirit had long been sustained and fed amidst the vicissitudes of his chequered career.

Clarendon, his base and heartless betrayer, has affected to sketch the portrait of his noble-minded victim with a more than usual portion of affected candour. It is a false resemblance throughout. "The character of the murdered was to be written for posterity; the murderer had the pen in his hand; and with the same infernal skill which had contrived the doom, he could blacken, for a while, the very memory of his victim."¹ Burnet represents Vane as naturally "a very fearful man, whose head was as darkened in his notions of religion as his mind was clouded with fear," and Hume characterises his theological writings as "absolutely unintelligible." There is no doubt that Vane had some singularly mystical notions about him, and that he has written much which, to ordinary minds at least, is not only dark but incomprehensible. But it has been justly observed, that the fault of obscurity might lie in the subject treated of, rather than in the writer. His works, besides the one already mentioned, are, 'The retired man's meditations, or the mystery and power of godliness showing forth in the living world;' an essay, entitled, 'Of the love of God and union with God;' an 'Epistle General to the mystical body of Christ on earth;' 'The Face of the Times;' and 'The people's cause stated,' to which are added sundry meditations on life, government, friendship, enemies, death, written during his last imprisonment. In the first of these works, Sir Henry contends strongly for the personal reign of Christ on earth during the millennium. We might quote many passages of great beauty from it, but we shall be doing more justice to Vane's genius by selecting a specimen of his argumentative writing from his observations on the fall of man. "The occasion of this," says he, "was twofold: First, the present enjoyment of good from God under the ministry of the first covenant, the fruit of which, to the eye of flesh and blood even at its best, was so glorious, and appeared so beautiful and desirable, that man was easily perswaded that it was the best and highest attainment hee needed to look after; and thereby, through Sathan's subtilty, rendered secure and negligent as to the use of means given by God to carry him on, pass him through and conduct him out of this his corruptible state, as from glory to glory, into the power of an endless life (without the intervening of sin) to the full and perfect securing of man's nature from all prevailing power of sins assaults for ever; which was not done by creation.

"The second occasion of mans fall, was the freedom of his will, wherein the judging and desiring faculties of his mind were entirely committed by God to his own free motion and operation, upon the terms of the covenant he was brought into with God; which was, to be dealt with according unto his works, to be rewarded with life or with death, as he should rightly order or abuse this liberty of action with which God had invested him by way of tryal and probation. That man had such a power of free-will as this,

"First, the nature and tenor of the Covenant he was taken into, doth demonstrate; which is conditional in reference to the works of man; And God throughout deals with man under that Covenant according to his works, strongly thereby asserting them to be man's own; so as the very reward which comes thereby, is accounted to him of debt, even

¹ See Westminster Review, vol. viii. p. 349.

the thing which his own action (as left alone unto himself therein) hath brought upon him, and entitled him unto.

"Secondly, without such a power of free-will, man's first estate could not have been mutable, at least could never have changed into corruption; for if it had been necessary to him to have stood, he could not have fallen; and if it had been necessary to him to fall, God had thereby made himself the Author of sin, which could not be."

Sir Richard Fanshawe.

BORN A. D. 1608.—DIED A. D. 1666.

SIR RICHARD FANSHAWE, was the younger son of Sir Henry Fanshawe of Ware Park, Hertfordshire. He was born in 1608, and was originally intended for the bar; but abandoning that profession, he spent two or three years abroad. On returning to England, he was presented at court, and in 1630, was appointed secretary to Lord Aston's embassy to Spain. On the recall of Lord Aston, Fanshawe became charge d'affaires at the Spanish court, and held that appointment until 1638. Two years after his return to England from Spain, his elder brother resigned the office of remembrancer of the court of exchequer in his favour; and shortly after, in the capacity of one of the royal household, he accompanied the king to Oxford on the breaking out of the civil wars. Here he first met his future wife Ann, daughter of that staunch royalist Sir John Harrison of Balls in Hertfordshire, to whom he was married in May 1644, and who was destined to embalm the memory of her husband in one of the most interesting volumes of autobiography ever penned.¹ Before his marriage, Sir Richard was sworn secretary-at-war to the prince of Wales.

In the suite of the prince, Fanshawe travelled to Bristol, and afterwards embarked for Scilly and Jersey. On the departure of Charles for Paris, he went to his brother at Caen, and sent his wife to England to procure some pecuniary supplies for him. She succeeded in obtaining leave for her husband to return and compound for her estates. They lived very privately in London for some months, and whilst the king was at Hampton court they were honoured with several audiences from him. Of some of these interviews, Lady Fanshawe has given an exceedingly interesting account in her autobiography. "The last time I ever saw the king," she says, "when I took my leave, I could not refrain weeping. When he had saluted me, I prayed to God to preserve his majesty with long life and happy years. He stroked me on the cheek and said: 'Child, if God pleaseth it shall be so, but both you and I must submit to God's will, and you know in what hands I am.'" Then turning to your father, she continues, "he said: 'Be sure, Dick, to tell my son all that I have said, and deliver these letters to my wife,—pray God bless her! I hope I shall do well.'" And taking him in his arms, said: 'Thou hast ever been an honest man, and I hope God will bless thee and make thee a happy servant to my son, whom I have charged in my letter to continue his love and trust to you.' Adding, 'I do promise you that if ever I am restored to my dignity I will bountifully reward you both for your service and sufferings.'" ²

¹ *Memoirs of Lady Fanshawe.* Lond. Svo. 1829.

² *Memoirs*, p. 67.

month of October that same year, Fanshawe and his wife went to France. They returned to England in April 1648, from which time he was employed on the prince's affairs in Paris, Flanders, Ireland, and Spain. In all these journeys he was accompanied by his faithful and affectionate wife, who encountered her husband's manifold difficulties and privations with all the fortitude of a heroine.

When Fanshawe joined the king in Scotland, the Yorkists intrusted him with the great and privy seal, and wished him to take the covenant, but this he steadfastly refused to do. In the battle of Worcester he was taken prisoner and sent to London, whither his affectionate spouse accompanied him. Her unwearied solicitation at last wrought upon Cromwell, who allowed her husband to be set at liberty upon a physician's certificate of bad health.

On the death of Cromwell, Sir Richard, who had been created a baronet in 1654, obtained permission to go abroad. On the restoration he was promised one of the state-secretaryships, but was disappointed through the interference of 'that false man'—as Lady Fanshawe calls him—Lord Clarendon. He was, however, honoured with the appointment to negotiate Charles's marriage with Catherine of Portugal, and, when the queen landed at Portsmouth, was sent to congratulate her on her arrival. He was immediately afterwards appointed ambassador to the court of Lisbon, and on his return from that mission, was made a privy-councillor of England. In January, 1664, he was constituted ambassador to the Spanish court. Having signed a treaty in December 1665, which the ministry at home refused to ratify, he was superseded by the earl of Sandwich. A few days after having introduced his lordship to his first audience, Sir Richard was taken ill, and died at Madrid on the 26th of June 1666. His wife, whose autobiography forms so noble a monument to her husband's memory, died in 1680.

Bertie, Earl of Lindsey.

BORN A. D. 1608.—DIED A. D. 1666.

MONTAGUE BERTIE, second earl of Lindsey, was the eldest son of Lord Willoughby of Erseby, by Elizabeth, daughter of Edward, first Lord Montague of Broughton. In early life, he served as a volunteer in two or three campaigns in Flanders. On his return to England, he was appointed captain of the king's life-guard; and, in this capacity, he attended Charles into Scotland in 1639.

At the battle of Edgehill, in which his father was taken prisoner, Montague distinguished himself by the gallant but unavailing efforts which he made to rescue his parent. He was taken prisoner himself, and, although the king made proposals for his release, his captors thought it expedient to detain him for nearly a whole year in their hands. On being at last liberated, he joined Charles at Oxford, and thenceforward became one of his principal advisers. He fought at the head of his old regiment, the life-guard, in the battles of Newbury, Cropredy bridge, and Naseby. In the latter engagement he was wounded. When Charles put himself into the hands of the Scots, Lindsey surrendered to the parliamentary army, and, after a brief imprisonment, was released on parole. The king appointed him one of his commissioners in the

treaty of Newport, and honoured him with a small token of his regard the day before his execution.

At the Restoration, Lindsey's services were rather overlooked. He had been exceedingly active in promoting Charles's return; and had even suffered a brief imprisonment in 1655, on suspicion of treasonable practices against the government. For these services he now obtained an empty decoration and a seat at the privy-council, and that only at the earnest solicitation of Clarendon. He died in 1666. Lloyd tells us that "his converse have the world a singular pattern of harmless and inoffensive mirth; of a nobleness not made up of fine clothes and courtship; a sweetness and familiarity that at once gained him love, and preserved respect; a grandeur and nobility, safe in its own worth, not needing to maintain itself by a jealous and morose distance; the confirmed goodness of his youth not only guarding his mind from the temptation of vice, but securing his fame too from the very suspicion of it, so outstripping, in wisdom, temperance, and fortitude, not only what others did, but even what they wrote, being as good in reality as in pretence; to which he added this unusual glory—that, since there was but a small partition between the kings of Judah's beds and the altar, through which they said David had a secret passage, (arguing the nearness there should be between religion and honour,) and that the cross was an ornament to the crown, and much more to the coronet, he satisfied not himself with the bare exercise of virtue, but he sublimated it, and made it grace." Lloyd adds, that he was educated with great care; that he prosecuted his tour of the continent with a contempt of the inconveniences then incident to it, and a spirit of observation and inquiry uncommon in young men of his rank; and that "the result of these and other advantages, was a competent skill in arts, especially philosophy, mathematics, physick, and the two parts belonging to it, chirurgery and botanick."

William Prynne.

BORN A. D. 1600.—DIED A. D. 1669.

THIS most voluminous writer and busy man, was born in 1600, at Swanswick in Somersetshire, and educated at a grammar school in Bath. At the age of sixteen he entered as a commoner of Oriel college, Oxford. After remaining there four years, he took his bachelor's degree and removed to Lincoln's inn for the study of the law. Here he spent his time diligently in that faculty, and also paid considerable attention to polemical theology and the subject of church-government. To these subjects he was the more drawn by his attendance on the preaching of the celebrated Dr Preston, who was then lecturer of Lincoln's inn, and who was considered as the head of the puritan cause. Of this excellent preacher, Prynne became a great admirer, and entered much into his views of the church of Christ, adopting ultimately the Genevan discipline.

With these sentiments, and with his zealous temperament, he could not behold the increasing luxury and profligacy of the court and the nation unconcerned, he therefore set himself in opposition to that prime source of the corruption of public morals, the stage;

and, in 1632, brought out his work against plays and actors under the pungent title of *Histrionastix*. The work was licensed by Archbishop Abbot's chaplain, but this did not protect its author from severe penalties on account of certain passages supposed to reflect on the Queen, Henrietta Maria. The narrative of this malicious prosecution is thus given by Wood. "There being a reference in the table of this book to this effect, 'women-actors notorious whores,' relating to some women-actors mentioned in his book, as he affirmeth, it happened, that, about six weeks after this the queen acted a part in a pastoral at Somerset-house; and then Archbishop Laud and other prelates, whom Prynne had angered by some books of his against Arminianism, and against the jurisdiction of bishops, and by some prohibitions which he had moved and got to the high-commission court,—these prelates and their instruments, the next day after the queen had acted her pastoral, showed Prynne's book against plays to the king, and that place in it—'women-actors notorious whores;' and they informed the king and queen, that Prynne had purposely written this book against the queen and her pastoral; whereas it was published six weeks before that pastoral was acted."

The king commissioned Laud to put the affair into the hands of his attorney-general, Noy, who entered heartily into the business, and prosecuted it with so much eagerness that Prynne was committed prisoner to the Tower; and, after some months, was "sentenced by the star-chamber to be fined £5000 to the king, expelled the university of Oxford, and Lincoln's inn, degraded and disabled from his profession in the laws, to stand in the pillory, first in the palace-yard in Westminster, and three days after in Cheapside; in each place to lose an ear; to have his book called *Histrionastix*, publicly burnt before his face by the hand of the hangman, and remain prisoner during life." This unjust and cruel sentence being executed in May 1634, Prynne was remanded to prison; and, in the following month, wrote a severe letter to Laud respecting his sentence and the allegations of the archbishop before the high-commission. Laud complained to the king of this letter, and his majesty commanded the archbishop to commit the matter to attorney-general Noy, who immediately sent for Prynne, demanding to know whether the letter was his hand-writing. Prynne artfully replied, that unless he saw the letter it was impossible that he should answer that question. Having received the letter for perusal, while Noy's back was turned, he tore the letter in pieces and threw it out of the window. Noy and the archbishop were enraged and brought the matter before the court, but Prynne had taken care to destroy all proof of the fact of writing, and the prosecution was dropped. While Prynne was thus opposed to the bishops and the corruptions of the age, he was, notwithstanding, the object of commiseration by the virtuous and religious part of the nation. Sir Simonds D'Ewes mentions the occurrence with much regret, and says, "I went to visit him a while after in the Fleet and to comfort him; and found in him the rare effects of an upright heart and a good conscience, by his serenity of spirit and cheerful patience." While confined in prison he continued his writings on the great topics of the day. The following extract from one published in 1636, a small 4to. entitled, "The unbishopping of Timothy and Titus, or a briefe elaborate discourse, proov-

ing Timothy to be no bishop (much lesse any sole or Diocæsan bishop) of Ephesus, nor Titus of Crete; and that the power of ordination, or imposition of hands belongs *Jure divino* to presbyters as well as to bishops, and not to bishops onely," will afford a specimen of Prynne's manner and character. Speaking of the censure of the bishops on Dr Bastwick for his book against the pope and the Italian bishops, he says: "Now, because in that late censure of theirs, they all founded the divine right of their episcopal superintendency and dominion over their fellow-presbyters, only on the examples of Timothy and Titus,—whom they then new consecrated diocesan bishops over Ephesus and Crete, almost 1600 years after their decease, though Christ and Paul himself had never done it in their life times,—and, on a supposed divine monopoly of conferring orders and imposing hands, appropriated by God himself to diocesan bishops, distinct in jurisdiction, power, and degree from ministers and presbyters:—I have therefore here, for the future quieting of this much-agitated controversy, confined my discourse within the lists of such questions, not formerly fully debated by any in the English tongue, that I have met with; by the discussion whereof I have, I suppose, so shaken these rotten pillars and undermined these sandy foundations of their high-towering, over-swelling hierarchy, as that I have left them no divine prop or groundwork to support it longer, so as it must now certainly (for any stay is left it in scripture) come tumbling down headlong to the very ground;—and methinks I hear the fall of it already sounding in my ears;—unless with speed they wholly quit these false foundations, and bottom their prelacy and jurisdiction only on his majesty's princely favour, (not God's or Christ's divine institution,) which they have so lately judicially disclaimed in open court, and, even at this present, execute all acts of episcopal jurisdiction by their own inherent power, without any special commission from his majesty under his great seal, keeping their courts, visitations, and making out all their citations, process, excommunications, probate of wills, letters of administration, &c. in their own names and under their own seals, as if they were absolute popes and monarchs contrary to the statutes of 25th, 26th, 37th, Henry VIII. 1st of Edward VI., 1st and 8th of Elizabeth, their oath of supremacy and their high commission itself. Thus because they now of late are grown so, not being content with the office of a bishop, but they must also be kings, temporal lords, and chief state officers, against Christ's express command and God's own law, to sway both church and state at pleasure, that so they may engross into their sacred hands the sole rule and government of the world, having great possessions, and being great lords also as they are prelates, and yet doing nothing therefore at all in point of preaching, feeding, and instructing the people committed to their spiritual charge;—which swelling greatness and ambition of theirs, as it will make their downfall the greater, so the speedier, being a sure prognostic of their approaching ruin, as the greatness of any unnatural swelling in the body is of its presently ensuing rupture. Towards which their desired speedy downfall, if these my unworthy labours shall through God's blessing on them, and thy prayers, Christian reader, for them contribute any assistance, for the ease, relief, or comfort of God's poor people, who are every where most wrongfully, without, yea against all law and reason, oppressed and cast out of their benefices, freeholds,

possessions ; imprisoned, fined, excommunicated, silenced, suspended, vilified, crushed and trodden under feet by their intolerable tyranny; might and unbounded extravagant power, I shall neither repent me of the penning, nor thou thyself of the reading of it." This spoken in the third person must have been sufficiently galling to their lordships; what must they have felt then, on reading such language as the following addressed to them personally in 'a brief exhortation to the archbishops and bishops of England in respect of the present pestilence,' prefixed to the above work on episcopacy? "It may be that in regard of your sacred episcopal order, you conceit yourselves altogether *plague-free*, and as wholly exempt from divine as you now strive to be from temporal jurisdiction, which makes you neither to dread the plague, which has seized upon sundry kings and laid them in the dust, nor as yet any way to endeavour by fasting and prayer, to prevent either it, or that famine likely to accompany it. But to instruct you how you are still but men, and so exposed to all those mortal sicknesses which continually assault the crazy fortresses of our earthly tabernacles,—*non obstante* your rochets, mitres, crosiers and all other your episcopal harness,—give me leave in a word or two to acquaint you that Pelagius the Second, though a pope and bishop of Rome, notwithstanding his pontifical robes, exorcisms, pomp and charms, was both seized upon and devoured of this impartial disease, anno domini 591 ; which plague, as Petrus Blesensis, archideacon of Bath records, was sent by God as a just judgment upon the Romans and Italians, for giving themselves to drinking, feasting, dancing, sports and pastimes, even on Easter day, and other following holydays, after their participation of the blessed sacrament of Christ's body and blood,—many of them being consumed and dying of the plague in the very midst of their sports, mirth, ales and pastimes,—and on this pope himself for not restraining them from this prophaneness:—a precedent which should make your lordships fear and tremble, this present plague beginning here on Easter-week last, as that plague then did ; no doubt for the self-same profanation of God's own day and sacraments, with those abuses, sports, sins, pastimes for which they then were plagued, which your lordships have not only not restrained but countenanced, patronized, and propagated all you could, this pope going not so far."

"This gross profanation of the Lord's day, both in doctrine and practice, hath, no doubt, so far provoked our most gracious God, that now he can hold off his hands no longer from smiting us with his dreadful judgments, which some of us have already felt, and most of us now fear ; who, questionless, will never take off his pests and judgments from us till your lordships shall take off your most unjust suspensions and censures from those who have thus suffered in his quarrel, and all of us repented of this our crying sin of profaning God's own sacred day both in point of doctrine and practice,—an abomination never more rife in any than this our present age, by reason of your lordships patronising, propagating, and defending of it, in such a public, shameless, violent manner, as no former age can ever parallel, to God's dishonour, your own eternal infamy, and the fitting of yourselves and this whole kingdom for those public judgments, not only of a late extraordinary cold winter, and two successive dry summers, which threaten a famine of bread to recompense that famine of God's word that you have lately

caused, to omit all other miseries which we suffer, but likewise of that plague which is now dispersed. In the pulling down thereof, as your lordships have had, no doubt, a deeper hand than others, so you have great cause to fear you shall feel the irresistible mortiferous stroke thereof as much, or more than others. The plague, you well know, is God's own arrow, who ordaineth his arrows against the persecutors. And are not some at least of your lordships such? It is God's own hand. Now, God's hand shall find out all his enemies; his right hand shall find out those that hate him. And are not many of your lordships in that number? It is God's own brandished sword. And whom doth God wound and slay therewith but the head of his enemies, and the hairy scalp of those who go on still in their trespasses? And are not too many of your lordships such, who, even now, in the very midst of God's judgments, proceed on still in your malicious, violent, implacable hatred, enmities and persecutions against God's faithful ministers, saints, and the very power of holiness; in your lordly pomp, ambition, avarice, pride, envy, arrogance, cruelty, oppression, injustice, luxury, secularity, suppression of preaching, prayer, fasting, communion of saints, and whatever savours of piety; and in profaning of God's own sacred day both in your doctrine and practice, which is seldom worse solemnized or more profaned, as Master Bucer long since observed, '*Quam in ipsis episcoporum aulis,*' than in bishops' own palaces, where neither lord, nor chaplain, nor servant make any great conscience of profaning it sundry ways, to give the better example of piety and holiness unto others. How then, being heavy laden with these many sins, and having the prayers, the cries, the clamours, the tears, the sighs and groans of all God's people against you, if not of the whole kingdom too, the daily imprecations of many distressed ministers and people whom you have most injuriously and inhumanly handled without any lawful cause, can you but fear God's vengeance, and expect his plagues to sweep such clods of sin and mischief, such pests and prodigies as you are, clean away?" In this strain, after the manner of the Jewish prophets, he proceeds with his exhortation to their lordships, who, on ascertaining him to be the author of this and similar works during 1635, 1636, and 1637, brought him again into the star-chamber in June, 1637, and he was there sentenced to be fined £5,000 to the king, to lose the remainder of his ears in the pillory, to be branded on both cheeks with the letters "S. L." for Schismatical libeller, and to be imprisoned for life in Caernarvon castle. This rigorous sentence was carried into effect in July following, in Palace-yard, Westminster. In January, 1638, he was removed to Mount Orgueil castle, in the isle of Jersey, where he still continued his incessant labours in writing for the press.

On the meeting of the long parliament in November, 1640, one of its first acts was to release Mr Prynne from his long and unjust imprisonment, and in the same month he entered London, in company with his fellow-sufferer Burton, amidst the triumphant acclamations of the people, to the number of ten thousand persons, with boughs and flowers in their hands. On his arrival in town, Prynne presented a petition to the house of commons, complaining of the persecutions which he had suffered from Archbishop Laud, and the house voted him the sum of four thousand pounds by way of reparation, which sum,

however, it appears, he did not actually receive. Shortly after the opening of parliament, he was elected for Newport, in Cornwall, and distinguished himself as the opponent of prelacy and arbitrary power. Here was a field for the most ample development of Prynne's powers and resources, and he entered warmly into the controversies arising out of the avowed determination of the king to reduce the three kingdoms to perfect conformity in religion. This was so far from being practicable, that the more the subject was discussed the farther did parties recede from each other, until, at length, the distinct systems contended for equalled the number of the kingdoms which were to be reduced to uniformity—the episcopalian, the presbyterian, and the independent.

Prynne was himself a staunch presbyterian, and, like many of his party at the time, was for establishing that form of church-government to the exclusion of all others. The independents, alone, professed the principle of toleration. With John Goodwin, an eminent minister of this persuasion, Prynne engaged in controversy,—first on the subject of Arminianism, which Goodwin favoured,—and next on that of toleration. Prynne undertook to demonstrate its mischievous tendency, and insists that the parliament, having subscribed to the covenant, cannot, without perjury, suffer such doctrines or publications as Goodwin's to be issued to the world. One of Prynne's pieces in this debate is entitled, 'Truth triumphing over falsehood—antiquity over novelty ; or a vindication of the undoubted jurisdiction and coercive power of Christian emperors, kings, and parliaments, in matters of religion.' The publication of this piece brought the celebrated John Lilburne against Prynne, who was thought now to be inconsistent for wishing to abridge others of that liberty of speech which he had himself suffered for by the persecutions of the star-chamber. Lilburne answered Prynne's volume in a pamphlet of seven pages, and says—"Truly, had I not seen your name to your books, I should rather have judged them a papist's or a jesuit's than Mr Prynne's ; and, without doubt, the pope, when he sees them, will canonize you for a saint, for throwing down his enemy, Christ."

For this free language Prynne caused Lilburne, by a vote of the house of commons, to be summoned before the committee for examinations. Lilburne, however, on producing a paper containing his reasons for his letter to Prynne, was discharged. The following month, Lilburne was again taken into custody, at the instance of Prynne, and brought before the council on suspicion of being concerned in several publications hostile to the presbyterian system ; but, after one night's detention, he was discharged.

In 1647, Prynne was one of the parliamentary visitors of the university of Oxford ; and, during the long parliament, sided zealously with the presbyterians. When Cromwell and the political independents, however, acquired more influence, Prynne exerted himself to the utmost against them, and even went so far as to promote the interest of the falling monarch. When Charles was in treaty with the parliament respecting the terms on which peace might be restored, and the army were violently opposed to the negotiation, Prynne made a powerful speech in favour of the royal proposals, which so influenced the house that, without a division, they resolved that, "the answers of the king

to the propositions of both houses are a ground for the house to proceed upon, for the settlement of the peace of the kingdom."

In the course of the speech he says:—"I have never yet received one farthing recompense from the king, or any other, though I have waited above eight years at your doors for justice and reparations, and neglecting my own private calling and affairs, employed most of my time and studies, and expended many hundred pounds out of my purse, since my enlargement, to maintain your cause against the king, his popish and prelatical party. For all which cost and labour I never yet demanded nor received one farthing from the houses, nor the least office or preferment whatsoever, though they have bestowed divers places of honour upon persons of less or no desert. Nor did I ever yet receive so much as your public thanks for any public service done you (which every preacher usually receives for every sermon preached before you, and most others have received for the meanest services), though I have brought you off with honour in the cases of Canterbury and Macguire, when you were at a loss in both, and cleared the justness of your cause, when it was at the lowest ebb, to most reformed churches abroad, who received such satisfaction from my books, that they translated them into several languages; and I have engaged many thousands for you at home by my writings, who were formerly dubious and unsatisfied."

After the death of the king, Prynne still opposed Cromwell, and was, in consequence, committed close prisoner to Dunster castle, Somersetshire. After a considerable time, he obtained his release by insisting strongly on magna charta, and the liberty of the subject, and again entered zealously into the religious controversies of the day.

Being considered one of the secluded members of the house of commons, he was, in 1659, restored to his seat; and, on the movement for the restoration of Charles II., was particularly zealous for that measure. In 1660 he was chosen member for Bath, and expected to be made a judge. "When the king was asked what should be done with Prynne to keep him quiet, Why, said he, let him amuse himself with writing against the catholics, and in poring over the records in the Tower." He was therefore appointed chief-keeper of the records, with a salary of £500 per annum. He died at his chambers in Lincoln's inn, October 24, 1669, and was interred under the chapel there.

Prynne's separate publications amount to about two hundred, of various bulk, from the pamphlet to the folio. He has therefore earned the title bestowed on him by Wood, of 'voluminous Prynne.' It is thought that, reckoning from the time of coming to manhood, he wrote a sheet for every day of his life. He read or wrote during the whole day; and, that he might not be interrupted, had no regular meals, but took as he had occasion the refreshment of bread, cheese, and ale, which was placed at his side. His works, in forty volumes folio and quarto, he presented to the library of Lincoln's inn.

His principal law works are, 'Records,' in three volumes folio; 'Parliamentary writs,' in four parts 4to.; 'Sir Robert Cotton's abridgement of the Tower Records, with amendments and additions,' folio; and 'Observations on the Fourth Part of Coke's Institutes,' folio.

Thomas, Lord Fairfax.

BORN A. D. 1611.—DIED A. D. 1671.

THOMAS FAIRFAX was the eldest son of Ferdinando, Lord Fairfax, and was born in January, 1611, at Darton in Otley, Yorkshire. He received his education at Saint John's college, Cambridge, and on leaving the university, proceeded to Holland, where he served as a volunteer, under the command of Horatio, Lord Vere. Soon after his return to England, he married the daughter of that nobleman, and became one of the most conspicuous champions of the popular party, which now began its formidable opposition to the proceedings of government. Both his wife's family and his own were zealously attached to the Presbyterian forms of religion, and the station which his father occupied in the country pointed him out as a fit leader in all the movements of the opposition. When the unfortunate Charles was preparing to form a guard at York, he headed the numerous multitude who petitioned the monarch on that occasion, and presented the document which contained their complaints from his saddle.¹ On the breaking out of the war, he was appointed to a command under his father, and early displayed those talents which subsequently raised him to the highest post in the nation. The first occasion on which he distinguished himself was in an encounter at Bradford with a body of royalists, whom he compelled to retire from their station, and proceed to Leeds. At Tadcaster, where he and his father were opposed to the earls of Newcastle and Cumberland, his fortune was different, and he found it necessary to make his way to Bradford again, where he remained for a short time, and then led his troops to Leeds. Here victory declared in his favour, and this important town opened its gates to his forces on the 23d of January, 1642-3. Other successes followed this important action. He next joined his father, then retreating before the earl of Newcastle at Sherburne; and soon after suffered two successive defeats, the one at Bramham-moor, the other upon Seacroft-moor, which he was accustomed to regard as the worst defeat he suffered throughout his career. He and his father were, however, almost equally unsuccessful in their battle with the earl of Newcastle on Adderton-moor, on the 30th of June; and soon after he was obliged, at imminent peril, to force his way through a strong force of royalists who had surrounded him in the town of Bradford. He had an equally narrow escape at Selby, where he received a shot in his left wrist while on horseback, and bleeding as he was, had to conduct his men a journey of several miles. At length, after several disasters, and a few brilliant successes, he sat down with the subsidiary troops under the earls of Leven and Manchester before York. The struggle which took place between the two parties on this occasion was long and fierce.

At Marston-moor, Fairfax commanded the right wing of the cavalry, but was driven off the field by Prince Rupert, who directed the chief of his strength against that part of the enemy. Victory, however, decided in favour of the parliamentarians, and on the 15th

¹ Sprigge, p. 8.

of July, the city of York opened its gates to the conquerors. The career of Sir Thomas was soon after this on the point of being terminated. In an attack on Helmesley castle, he received a dangerous wound in his shoulder, and had scarcely recovered from this, when, according to Whitelock, he was near being killed by a cannon-ball from Pomfret-castle, before which he was standing with Colonel Forbes. "It came betwixt them," says that writer, "and the wind of it beat them both to the ground, and put out one of Colonel Forbes's eyes, and spoiled that side of his face, and yet no other hurt to Sir Thomas Fairfax."

The conduct he had displayed as a general, on many occasions of great difficulty, had, by this time, gained him the applause both of the army and the parliament. With the exception of himself and Cromwell, no man of very eminent ability appeared to claim the entire confidence of the victorious party, and when it was deemed advisable to remove the earl of Essex from his post as commander-in-chief, he was appointed to that station, with Cromwell as lieutenant-general. His reception by the parliament on his arrival in London, was indicative of the estimation in which he was held by that body, and an ordinance being issued for raising a new body of forces, he was granted the privilege of choosing the officers who were to command under him. A few days after his appointment to this important station, he was nominated governor of Hull, and having been thus rewarded for his past services by the representatives of the nation, set out on his return to the scene of conflict. He reached the king's forces at Naseby, and obtained a victory, which rendered the rest of his progress comparatively easy. One town after another fell into his hands; Leicester, Warwick, Bath, Bristol, and other places of inferior note surrendered to his army. Exeter, after an obstinate siege, did the same, and all the western counties were thus reduced to acknowledge the authority of the parliament. Oxford was the next object of his attack, and on the 24th of June, 1646, it capitulated. After some minor triumphs, and having fully completed the expectations which the parliament had formed of his capacity, he returned to London, and was met on his approach to the city by a numerous concourse of the people, anxious to hail him as the great champion of their cause.²

It is generally believed that Cromwell, though occupying only the second station in command, exercised in reality by far the greater portion of authority; that he was the author of the measures on which Sir Thomas Fairfax acted; and that to his influence and discretion may be ascribed much of the success which attended the progress of the army. Looking at the character of the two men, we are easily led to conclude that this is not a false statement of the case. The impetuosity of character which distinguished Sir Thomas as a commander, is rarely combined with cool judgment, and the power of careful deliberation. Had he possessed such a combination of excellencies he would have been the equal of any man of his age, and it would be next to impossible to account for the superiority which Cromwell, in a short time, openly exercised over him. Whatever share, however, Cromwell merited in the triumphs of Fairfax, it was to his own military ca-

² Rushworth, Whitlocke.

pacify in the main, that the royalists owed their defeat. The two parties were frequently brought together in situations in which valour and conduct in the field were the chief engines by which the fate of the cause was to be determined. As an actor, therefore, in these eventful times, Fairfax may well be regarded, if not the principal, as very little below him. The credit due to him is, however, it must be confessed, of an inferior kind. His share of the victory was won by knowing how to direct brute force; Cromwell gained his by a surpassing skill in the management of men's minds; and hence the reason not only why that subtle politician at length rose so superior to his associates, but why, independent of the consideration of his power, the character of Fairfax and the rest of the parliamentarians make so little figure in history when compared with that of the protector.

The victorious commander-in-chief remained in London till he was sent into the north to escort the unfortunate monarch to the capital. It was now that all the intelligence of the parliamentarians was needed to determine in what way their triumph should be used. The existence of a large military force was evidently inconsistent with the good order of a government, which had not strength to control its motions. There were, therefore, two parties in the nation adverse to its continuance; the one consisting of persons who earnestly desired the settlement of the nation in peace and freedom; the other of those who looked forward to the time, when the army being disbanded, they might pursue their designs in the management of the state without a check. Sir Thomas Fairfax, it is said, was far from approving the conduct of some of his associates, and had formed the intention of resigning his command; but the influence which Cromwell possessed over him prevented his taking this step, and we consequently find him engaged in the most remarkable measures taken by the military party against the parliament. In March 1647--8, he became, by the death of his father, Lord Fairfax, and was soon after actively engaged in putting down the remnants of the royalist party, which made a last desperate effort in favour of their master. The siege of Colchester cost him eleven weeks of hard fatigue, but he revenged the opposition of the garrison and citizens in a manner little creditable to his character. Two men of rank and high honour, Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle, were ignominiously brought to a court-martial, and condemned, because they had manfully kept their posts to the last; the townspeople were oppressed with a fine of twelve thousand pounds, and no means were left unemployed to injure and insult them.

So satisfied, however, was Sir Thomas with his victory, that having made the circuit of the neighbouring counties, he returned to London in December, and took up his residence in the palace of Whitehall. The melancholy transactions which now occupied the nation, obtained a full share of his attention, and it seems that he was not far behind the most zealous of the parliamentary leaders in their persecution of the de-throned Charles. That he stopped short of the last act which desecrated the otherwise noble triumph of liberty, appears to have been less owing to the moderation of his own principles, than to the good sense, the justice and humanity of his wife. It is well known, that when his name was called, as the first on the list of the king's judges, she exclaimed from a distant part of the court that he had too

much wit to be there.³ The little exertion he made towards preventing the execution of the king when he was in possession of so much power to save him, tends strongly to confirm this suspicion, and leads to the conclusion, that if he was unwilling to have a share in the execution himself, he was not sorry to see others ready to fulfil the task. The account which Wood gives of his conduct affords, if correct, a curious proof of the insincerity of his expressions in the monarch's behalf. "'Tis true," says he, "that before the king was beheaded, he did use his power and interest to have the execution deferred for some days, forbearing his coming among the officers, and did fully resolve with his own regiment to prevent the execution, or have it deferred till he could make a party in the army to second his design; but behold his policy! All the morning of that day on which the king was beheaded, and the time when he was beheaded, he was with certain officers of the army at prayer or in discourse, or both, in Major Thomas Harrison's apartment in Whitehall, (being a room at the hither end of that gallery looking towards the privy garden,) and knew nothing of it, as it doth appear by this passage. When his majesty was beheaded, and his corpse thereupon immediately coffined and covered with a black velvet pall, Bishop Juxon who attended him on the scaffold, and Thomas Herbert, the only groom of his bedchamber that was then left, did go with the said corpse to the back-stairs to have it embalmed, and Mr Herbert, after the body had been deposited, meeting with the general, Fairfax asked him, 'how the king did?' Whereupon Herbert looking very strangely upon him, told him that 'the king was beheaded,' at which he seemed much surprised." As some apology, however, for his supineness at the time when his authority or power might have been most effectually exerted, he refused to become one of the new council of state, or declare that he approved of the late measures of the parliament. But this did not prevent his retaining the command of the army, at the head of which he dispersed a numerous body of insurgents, who, under the name of levellers, threatened to destroy every vestige of law and civilization. The reputation he enjoyed throughout the country from these continued and important successes, was testified by the manner in which he was every where received. The university of Cambridge made him a master of arts; Oxford conferred on him the degree of doctor of laws; and the citizens of London showed their respect for him by feasts, and the gift of a splendid bason and ewer of beaten gold. But his position was every day becoming more difficult to support with comfort or dignity. The wishes of his wife, and of the strong party of presbyterians whose principles and interests she endeavoured to support, were directly opposed to the measures of the existing government, and the declaration of Scotland in favour of Charles II. furnished an occasion for his final retirement from office. On refusing to lead the forces under his command into that country, he resigned his commission into the hands of parliament, which immediately settled a pension on him of five thousand pounds per annum, and transferred the authority he had relinquished to Cromwell.

Sir Thomas lived about eight years in retirement on his estate at Hunappleton, in Yorkshire. During this time his principles appear

to have received a continually increasing bias in favour of royalty, and at the first signal given him by General Monk, he assembled a body of volunteers, composed of the neighbouring gentry, and appeared in the field as the champion of Charles the second. His fame as a commander, combined with the popularity of the cause he had espoused, brought speedy accessions to his force, and he was soon enabled to make a free passage for Monk and his army. He was now again called to take a part in the operations of government; was elected a member of the council of state by the rump parliament; represented the county of York, in what was termed the healing parliament; and was one of the deputation appointed to invite the king to return to England. Having performed this office, he again retired into domestic privacy, which he continued to enjoy till the month of November 1671, when he ended his active and memorable career.

The character of this distinguished man was formed for the times in which he lived, and the party of which he was so conspicuous a member. He possessed military talents of a high order, was ardent in the support of the principles he espoused, and pursued the object he had in view with a perseverance as vigorous as it was successful. But fortunately for those with whom he was associated, he had little political sagacity; was incapable of managing the complicated and rapid machinery with which he stood surrounded; and was in every respect far better calculated to be the servant of a government than its chief. In both his public and his private conduct, the comparison of his character with that of most of the great men of his day, will be to his advantage. He wanted penetration and decision, and this led him into some important errors; but the readiness with which he yielded to the suggestions of the more moderate party, his acknowledged zeal for religion, his domestic virtues and attachment to literature, contribute a powerful plea in behalf of his name and character.

Monk, Duke of Albemarle.

BORN A. D. 1608.—DIED A. D. 1670.

GEORGE MONK, a general in the time of the commonwealth, and after the restoration made duke of Albemarle, was descended from an ancient family in Devonshire. His father was Sir Thomas Monk of Rotheridge, in that county. The fortunes of the family being much reduced about the time of Charles, George, who was a younger son, and born December 6, 1608, was devoted to the military profession. At the age of seventeen, he was induced to enter as a volunteer under Sir R. Grenville, in the expedition which was fitting out at Plymouth against Spain, and which was commanded by Lord Wimbledon. The year after, he obtained an ensigncy in the expedition against the isle of Rhe. He returned to England in 1628, but went out again as ensign in another expedition to the Low Countries, and there obtained the rank of captain. Having been about ten years abroad, and served in many sieges and battles, he acquired the reputation of an accurate acquaintance with the military art, and returned to his native country just as hostilities were on the eve of commencement between Charles I. and his subjects.

Monk being recommended to the king as an experienced and able officer, as well as cordially devoted to the royal interest, he received the rank of lieutenant-colonel, and served the king in both his expeditions against the Scotch. Upon the breaking out of the Irish rebellion he was made colonel, and having now the command of a regiment, he rendered such service to the cause of the king that he was appointed governor of Dublin. But the king's affairs in England coming now to an open rupture with the parliament, Monk was ordered into England with his regiment. At this period some suspicions appear to have fallen upon him respecting a truce which he had made with the Irish rebels, and upon his arrival at Bristol, orders were sent to the governor of that place to place him under arrest. But he suffered him to proceed on his parole to the king at Oxford. There he afforded such explanation of his conduct to Lord Digby, the secretary of state, that he was speedily introduced to the king, and as a compensation for the odium, under which he had unjustly laboured, he was made a major-general in the Irish brigade. Soon after, he was engaged in the siege of Nantwich, in Cheshire. Scarcely had he arrived before that place, when the whole brigade and its general fell into the hands of Sir Thomas Fairfax. Monk was sent prisoner to the Tower, where he remained above two years a close prisoner. In November, 1646, he agreed to purchase his liberty by taking the covenant, and to accept a command in the army of the parliament to serve in Ireland. The next year, the command of all the parliamentary forces in the north of Ireland was given him, and for two years he continued to distinguish himself as an able and experienced soldier. Soon after, his conduct in treating with the Irish rebels was called in question, and he was summoned to appear before parliament. Having been heard at the bar of the house, a vote was passed August 10, 1649, in which the disapprobation of parliament was expressed against the conduct of the general, but at the same time acquitting him of any intention to injure the interests of his country. The vote, however, together with the observations of some of the members upon his conduct, gave the general deep offence. Attempts were made to clear his reputation and honour—but still his misconduct could not be forgotten, nor wholly forgiven. About this period his elder brother died, and the family-estate came into his possession; he therefore withdrew from public scenes, and endeavoured to raise the fortunes of his family by attention to his private affairs. But after the entire overthrow of the royal cause, and establishment of the commonwealth, Monk accepted a commission under Cromwell against the Scots, who had proclaimed Charles II. At the great battle of Dunbar, where the Scottish forces were completely overthrown by Cromwell, Monk was a lieutenant-general, and rendered such distinguished services, that Cromwell soon after left him in the supreme command of the army in Scotland, while he followed Charles Stuart into England, whither he had fled after the battle of Dunbar. Soon after this period, Monk was obliged to relinquish active service on account of ill health. But being restored by a residence of some time at Bath, he was again employed as one of the commissioners for uniting the kingdom of Scotland to the English commonwealth. In the war with Holland he also acted as a naval commander, and was engaged with Admiral Blake and Dean when the Dutch fleet was defeated under the

celebrated Van Tromp. It is related of him in this naval battle, that Admiral Dean being killed by the first broadside of the enemy, Monk threw his cloak over the body, and continued the engagement without the slightest interruption, and even without allowing the enemy to perceive that one of our admirals had fallen. The promptitude of this act, as well as the skill with which he continued the fight—although, in a great measure, out of his own element—contributed to secure the triumph of the British flag. He was also engaged in another great victory over the Dutch commander, and it was by these distinguished successes that Cromwell was enabled soon after to adjust an advantageous treaty with that nation.

Upon the return of Monk, he was treated with great kindness and attention by the protector. A rebellion having broken out in Scotland against the protector's authority, Monk was sent down with forces to quell it. This took place in the spring of 1654, and by the end of August order was restored, and Monk took up his residence at Dalkeith, near Edinburgh, where, for the five following years, he continued to maintain with great firmness, if not with severity, the power of the commonwealth, and the authority of its protector. On the death of Oliver Cromwell, Monk joined in an address of congratulation to his son and successor. This soldier of fortune soon discovered the commanding situation which he occupied, and lost no opportunity of employing it to his own purposes. It would be inconvenient here to enter into a detail of the steps which, with more sagacity than principle, this crafty soldier adopted for the restoration of the exiled prince. By a well-concerted but treacherous plan, he made the parliament believe that he was entirely with them; and when he had brought his army near London, and had ascertained the strength of the royal partisans, he declared for the dissolution of the present parliament, and the calling a new and free one. This was on the 11th of February, 1660. In a month after, the long parliament was dissolved, and by the 25th of April, a new parliament was assembled. After sounding them cautiously, Monk openly broached the restoration by informing them that Sir J. Granville, a servant of the king, was waiting at their door with a letter from his majesty to that house. The whole scheme succeeded, and in a short time the exiled prince was restored, amidst a manifestation of national joy which was bitterly mocked by the disasters which followed. The immediate results, however, were as flattering as Monk could well have desired, at least for himself. He was immediately created duke of Albemarle, made a privy counsellor, endowed with the order of the garter, made prime minister, and loaded with pensions, inheritances, and honours. He did not long continue to enjoy the spoils he had won. He proved, however, a fit minister for the despicable prince he had raised to the throne, and for about eight or nine years maintained the eminent station he had acquired. At the age of sixty, his constitution began to show the effects of the arduous life he had passed, and though, so late as 1666, he took the command of the fleet, and again beat his former antagonist, Van Tromp, together with De Ruyter, yet his health was failing, and in 1670, on the 3d of January, he died of dropsy. His corpse lay in state at Somerset-house for several weeks, after which it was buried in Henry VII.'s chapel, in Westminster abbey.

During his confinement in the Tower, he composed 'Observations on military affairs, &c.' which was published soon after his death in a small folio. Some speeches and letters of his relating to the restoration were also published in London, 1714.

Montagu, Earl of Sandwich.

BORN A. D. 1625 —DIED A. D. 1672.

EDWARD MONTAGU, first earl of Sandwich, was the only son of Sir Sidney Montagu. He was born on the 27th of July, 1625. Sir Sidney had passed his life in the household service of James and Charles I., and was warmly attached to the royal family and the monarchical principle. He had firmness of mind, however, to resist the blandishments of a court, and, on some occasions, evinced an attachment to constitutional liberty, which was little calculated to advance his interests as a courtier and placeman. He died in 1642, after having evinced some disposition to join the parliamentary party in their more moderate measures of reform. His son, the subject of this sketch, at the early age of seventeen married Jemima, daughter of John, Lord Crewe,—an alliance which, in a great measure, identified the youthful husband with the commonwealth-men. The death of his father, not many months after, removed the last obstacle to his estrangement from the royal party, and in August, 1643, the youth received a commission from the parliament to raise a regiment of one thousand men in Cambridgeshire, and to take the command of it with the title of colonel. He was at the time on good terms with Cromwell, and probably owed this distinction to that great man's favour.

On the 6th of May, 1644, young Montagu gallantly headed his regiment at the storming of Lincoln, and in the battle of Marston moor, on the succeeding July, he acted with great skill and courage. In September, 1645, he had a brigade of four regiments entrusted to him at the siege of Bristol, and on the capture of that important place was despatched by Fairfax and Cromwell to communicate the news to parliament.

On the elevation of Cromwell to the protectorate, Montagu was nominated one of the supreme council of fifteen, and shortly after was joined to Desborough in the office of high-admiral. In 1656, he accompanied Blake to the Mediterranean; and on the death of that gallant seaman, was appointed admiral of the fleet in the Downs. In this situation, his diplomatic talents were called into exercise in the negotiations with Sweden and Denmark. But the death of Oliver Cromwell, and the confusion which followed, changed the face of affairs; and conceiving himself to have been injured by the existing government, he entered into the plans which were now ripening in England for the restoration of the monarchy. The failure of Booth's movement exposed the royalist leaders to no small danger, but Montagu, although he had so far committed himself as to leave Copenhagen without orders, boldly presented himself before the parliament, and urged, in justification of his conduct, that he had been compelled to return by shortness of provisions. He then resigned his command; and the parliament, being

already abundantly occupied with other matters, allowed him to retire quietly into the country.

On the return of Monk into England, and the restoration of the secluded members, Montagu and he were joined in a commission for the execution of the office of lord-high-admiral. The king secretly ratified this appointment; but such was Montagu's impatience to gain the royal favour, that he sailed for Holland without orders, leaving only two or three of the smaller ships to convey the parliamentary deputation. On his arrival, he surrendered his command to the duke of York, and, a few days after, received Charles on board his own ship. For these services, he was invested with the garter, and advanced to the peerage by the titles of Baron Montagu of St Neots, Viscount Hinchinbroke, and earl of Sandwich.

In June, 1661, he sailed on an expedition against the piratical states of Barbary; whence he proceeded to Lisbon, where, having officiated as proxy for Charles in the ceremony of espousing Catharine of Braganza, he conveyed that princess to Portsmouth. In the great engagement with the Dutch fleet, on the 3d of June, 1664, Sandwich, as admiral of the blue squadron, performed eminent services, and is said to have been the first to practise the bold expedient of breaking the enemy's line. There had long existed a great degree of jealousy betwixt Monk and Montagu. An opportunity which offered itself some time after this, of preferring a complaint against the earl, was eagerly embraced by Monk, who sought nothing less than the ruin of his rival. It would appear that, contrary to the admiralty rule that bulk, as it is called, of any captured ship, shall not be broken till it be brought into port, and adjudged to be lawful capture, Sandwich had gratified his seamen with a partial distribution of prize-money while yet at sea. Monk threatened him with impeachment, and succeeded in stirring up a great popular clamour against him; but the king dexterously interposed betwixt the rivals, and by appointing Sandwich his ambassador-extraordinary to the court of Madrid, got him honourably extricated from the danger and disgrace which threatened him. He arrived at Madrid in May, 1666, and was received with great distinctions. The objects of his mission were to negotiate a treaty of commerce with England, and to mediate a peace between Spain and Portugal. In both objects he was completely successful, and won for himself renewed royal favour and increased popularity.

In 1672, on the renewal of the Dutch war, he was again appointed vice-admiral of the fleet under the duke of York.—On the 28th of May, the hostile fleets joined battle. The earl's vessel was surrounded by fire-ships, which soon enveloped the vessel in flames. The surviving portion of his crew—of whom three-fourths had already fallen in the close and desperate fight, which the vessel had maintained with superior numbers—betook themselves to the long-boat, but the admiral obstinately refused to quit his ship, and perished in the flames. His body was picked up some days after. The determination with which he sacrificed his life is said to have been occasioned by an affront which he had received from the high-admiral immediately before going into action. Bishop Kennet says:—"The day before, there was great jollity and feasting in the English fleet, in the midst of which my lord of Sandwich was observed to say, that, as the wind stood, the fleet were in danger of

being surprised by the Dutch, and therefore, thought it advisable to weigh anchor and get out to sea. The duke of York, lord-high-admiral, slighted the advice, and retorted upon the earl that he spoke this out of fear, which reflection his lordship is thought to have so far resented, as, the next day, out of indignation, to have sacrificed his life, which he might otherwise have preserved." His remains were deposited in the same vault with those of his competitor, Monk.

END OF VOL. II.

1429-37.4





AUG 10 1953

